

THE
AMERICAN QUARTERLY
CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XII.

OCTOBER, 1859.

No. 3.

ART. I.—SCHAFF'S HISTORY AND MERCERSBURG
THEOLOGY.

History of the Christian Church. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D.,
Author of the "History of the Apostolic Church." From
the Birth of Christ to the Reign of Constantine, A. D.
1-311. New York: Charles Scribner. 1859. 8vo. pp.
535.

ONE of the most remarkable developments of our times, especially in our own country, is the springing up among us of a School of Theology represented by such men as Dr. SCHAFF, the author of the History before us, Dr. W. N. NEVIN, Dr. E. V. GERHART, Rev. Mr. HARBAUGH, &c., whose opinions have been given to the public mostly in the pages of the "Mercersburg Review." In certain respects, these men are more orthodox, more Catholic, and more Scriptural in their teaching, they represent more clearly and fairly the teaching of Holy Scripture and the Primitive Church than many,

we may say most, of the popular divines of our own branch of the Church. Having their descent from a different stock, tracing their genealogy through no Puritan rationalizing ancestry, they have been brought into more direct communication with the writings of the Early Church, which with the Revival of Learning exercised such prodigious influence upon the minds of Continental and Northern Europe at the Reformation. In their conception of the Church, or rather of the organic life of the Church, in their teaching as to the nature and efficacy of the Sacraments, in short, in their whole theory of the Gospel, as an organic, authoritative Institution, in distinction from an unbridled, self-willed Individualism, their views have been presented with a reality, truthfulness, and power, with such a noble, heroic disregard of the popular prejudices, the ignorant caprices and the vulgar whims of the age, as has often surprised, as much as it has delighted us. Again and again we have been led to ask, What shall hinder a full, perfect visible union between our own Church and men so completely in harmony with us on so many of the fundamental principles of our holy Religion? The late Liturgical Movement in this same denomination has pointed in the same direction, indicating the yearning of a spirit Catholic in its sympathies, and echoing to the voice of the universal Church in all ages of the world. It was not without reason that the late "Memorial Movement," so called, was started among us. It did not spring from a petty sectarian ambition; it was not meant as a master stroke of policy, nor as a bid to a popular whim, though it may have been regarded so, both within and without our Fold. But such men neither comprehend the times, nor the Church.

The History before us has called up the whole question with new interest; and, at the same time, we are obliged to say, it has given us the *data* for an answer to the enquiry which we have propounded above: why men, apparently so thoroughly Catholic on so many points of Christian theology, are yet in fact alien from us, and, as we fear, are destined to drift farther and farther even from their present moorings? We confess that we look upon this question as one of no ordinary moment. Everything indicates that on our own continent, in this new, fresh, virgin soil, great social questions are to be solved; and whether for the weal or woe of men, is to depend wholly upon the faithfulness or the unfaithfulness of the Church. Christ has no new Church to plant, no new Faith to teach. The "Church of the Future," which dreamers talk of, is to be the Church of the Past. That which hath

been, is that which shall be, and there will be no new thing under the sun. And as the Errors with which the age teems are only old heresies revamped; so the Church which we are to plant, and the Faith which we are to teach, are those which have the promise and the certainty of CHRIST'S perpetual presence, until the end of the world. And hence it is especially, that among the ranks of the so-called Protestants of our country we have watched with great interest a doctrinal development of so remarkable a character.

We propose to quote from these writers, briefly, yet enough to show their opinions on several points touching the Church, its Nature, the Sacraments, &c., &c.

And, first, as to the Church:

"Right or wrong, reasonable or unreasonable, the very idea of the Church which is now denounced in the quarter of which we are speaking, as no better than a silly dream, is that precisely which is found to pervade the reigning mind of the Church Catholic from the century of the Apostles down to the century of the Reformation. It meets us in the old Creeds; it speaks to us from every page of the Christian Fathers; it breathes through all the ancient Liturgies; it enters into the universal scheme of the Early Christian Faith."^{*}

"The coming of the Holy Ghost was not in order to the publication of the Holy Scriptures primarily, but in order to the founding of the Holy Catholic Church. For the thinking of the Early Christian world, therefore, it was not possible to place the Bible before the Church in the order of faith. The Church was for them a fact deeper and wider and nearer to the proper life of Christianity, than the Bible. Not with any feeling of disrespect for the Bible of course, and not from any doubt of its being the inspired Word of God, but because their sense of Christianity was such as to require this order rather than the other."[†]

"Beyond all question, the Creed means to affirm the being of the Church, as an indispensable link in the scheme of salvation, and as something not accidental merely, but essential to the constitution of Christianity. In this view it defines itself and fixes its own attributes. It is necessarily One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolical. It can be no real object of faith at all, except in this character and form. Its Ministry is of divine right. Its Sacraments convey grace. The scheme of the Creed, in a word, is Churchly throughout; and it is not possible to understand it, or to have any sympathy with it, except from the posture of a true Churchly Faith. For the strictly Puritanic mind, it can never seem to carry a right sound."[‡]

"Faith in the Church, with these Fathers, was not just faith in

^{*} Mercersburg Review, April, 1858, p. 177.

[†] *Ib.* pp. 192, 193.

[‡] *Ib.* pp. 193, 194.

bishops, or in an altar, or in the use of a liturgy, for bishops and altars, and liturgies were common among such as were held notwithstanding to have neither part nor lot in the true commonwealth of Christ. It terminated on what the Church was supposed to be as a divine mystery, back of episcopacy and behind all Sacraments, symbols and forms, the force of which must turn necessarily at last on its own nature."^{*}

"The whole Creed, thus, moves in the power of the Church system; all its articles have a Churchly tone and it is not possible for them to find a hearty and full response, where the Puritanic unchurchly spirit has come generally to prevail. This is the reason that it is so little popular with most of our religious sects at the present time. They can have no sympathy, as sects, with the old idea of the Church. Hence consciously or unconsciously, their indifference, if not positive dislike, to a symbol which is felt to be mysteriously full of it from beginning to end."[†]

"The hyper-spiritualistic notions of the age make no Earnest with the idea of the Church as a visible organism, governed by strict principles of ecclesiastical unity; and, as a matter of course, the authority of the Church sinks down to the level of a mere social arrangement."[‡]

"All theology, however, that ignores the Church, either in the days of the Apostles or afterwards, cannot stand the test of the most superficial biblical exegesis; and it is evidently too shallow and blind to bear the test of history in any sense. The Apostles themselves were called to their office in an orderly way, and they entered upon the discharge of its functions according to the laws and ordinances previously laid down."[§]

"The same order of things is to be continued according to all the facts in the premises, even unto the end of the world; at least, as regards the nature, the economy, and the ruling spirit of the Church. Unity and authority forever; whatever comes in conflict with this principle is abnormal and wrong."^{||}

"Its Œcumenical Councils never dreamed of tolerating a lawful rival by the side of their decisions and decrees; but the right of spiritual jurisdiction was strictly confined to the bosom and polity of the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church. Accordingly the voice of the Church, when thus officially expressed, was received as the very voice of the Holy Scriptures, and of the Holy Ghost, Who spake through it as the proper, infallible organ, and medium of divine truth."[¶]

"Modern Protestantism makes no merit of outward ecclesiastical unity, at least in the absolute *jure divino* sense in which it was always taken by the Catholic Church."^{**}

"We have no fears as regards the final success of the Church; for Christ is with her in spite of all the fanatical, heretical, and schismatical aberrations that afflict her at the present day, and He will over-

* Mercersburg Review, April, 1858, p. 194.

† *Ib.* p. 269.

§ *Ib.* p. 274.

¶ *Ib.* p. 284.

† *Ib.* pp. 196, 197.

|| *Ib.* p. 276.

** *Ib.* p. 288.

rule even the wrath of man for good; yet it is as clear as the mid-day sun, that, before she can take proper and satisfactory care of all the intellectual, social, and political interests of our country and of the world, as it now stands, she must use less slang and ultra-radical dogmatism and more fervor and unction; before she can sit and rule Queen of the nations, she must come back as an humble and modest bride, into holy wedlock with her glorified Bridegroom, and clothe herself with the pure garment of righteousness and sacramental unity. 'Church or no Church' is, emphatically, the question of the age; and American soil is the battle-ground on which the solemn problem of its relation to the future civil and religious liberties of our race is to be decided."*

We have quoted the more freely on this point of the nature, unity, and authority of the Church, because it is rare to find such wholesome truths so boldly and nobly uttered in these days of sickly, shallow, sentimental indifferentism; because the great truth of the Church, as an Article of our Faith, of our Creeds, must be sounded, with trumpet tone, through the length and breadth of the land; and because these extracts are but fair specimens of the teaching of this School of Theology on the point now before us.

On the subject of the Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and of the Rite of Confirmation, the teaching of this School is equally remarkable. They not only come up to the full Catholic teaching of our own branch of the Church as to the nature and efficacy of the Sacraments, but certain of their writers even go beyond our standards. For Rationalism may teach too much as well as too little on the efficacy of Sacraments. It may dogmatize superstitiously as well as sceptically. Indeed, on the Lord's Supper, the German Lutherans, at the Reformation, never rid themselves of certain gross and sensuous views of the nature of that Sacrament, and Dr. Nevin, perhaps the most prominent writer of the Mercersburg School, assigns a sacrificial character to this Sacrament, between which view and the Romish there is not difference enough to quarrel about.

Two or three extracts concerning the Sacraments are all that we need to give.

On the Sacraments:

"Hence the Sacraments are called the *visible* Word; by means of which the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit are yet more specially and impressively mediated than through the oral or written Word;

* Mercersburg Review, April, 1858, p. 291.

for, through them the general promises of grace are specially made over, sealed to and appropriated by each individual, which, for his personal relation to God, and the assurance of his being in a state of grace, is of the highest importance.”*

On Baptism :

“The baptismal transaction *assures* the person baptized that the inward work of the Holy Ghost is as certain and real as the outward use of the sign. He is as certainly introduced into the covenant of grace, that is, he is as certainly ingrafted into Christ, regenerated by His Spirit, and forgiven through His blood, as he is externally washed with water. The thing signified is objectively connected and conferred with the sign, as truly and really, as the sign itself is used.”†

On Confirmation :

“In the case of the believers at Samaria, and the twelve disciples at Ephesus, the laying on of hands was the *completion* of their baptism, and the impartation of the Holy Ghost. Why should not Confirmation now be regarded in the same light? Why should not all entering the Church in this sacramental way, believe in the real presence of grace, qualifying them from that time forth, for every duty which may be legitimately required at their hands? Let the Church of Christ and her sacred rites stand out trembling with their own heavenly fullness and divine power, and we shall require nothing to effect the greatest results, but the still small voice—the silent flow of grace through her regular ordinances, from Him who is her centre and life—mighty to save—her all and in all—to Whom be glory, world without end.”‡

On the Lord's Supper :

“The *other* Sacrament is the Holy Supper. As Baptism is the commencement and implantation of the Christian life, so the Lord's Supper serves to nourish and support it, and hence it is to be repeated, whilst repetition in the case of Baptism is inadmissible. The Holy Supper was instituted by Christ on the last night before His Passion, and the promise of Grace by which He communicates to us His presence and the benefits of His atonement, is expressly woven into the words of institution, since it is declared, ‘This is my body which is given for you,’ and ‘This is my blood shed for you and for many for the remission of sins.’”§

We need not say, that the utterance of language like that which we have quoted above, coming, too, from men of

* Mercersburg Review, July, 1857, p. 393.

† Ib. January, 1858, pp. 96, 97.

‡ Ib. January, 1858, p. 18.

§ Ib. July, 1857, p. 397.

learning, and occupying a position favorable for extensive influence, is one of the pregnant signs of the times. Its tone is so thoroughly Church-like, so utterly and radically opposed to that spirit of ultra-Protestantism which threatens to sweep away every vestige of Primitive Christianity, that we come once more to the question, What is it that separates these men from us? Agreeing with us on so many of the vital truths of the Christian System, looking at our common duties from the same stand-point, sympathizing with us, as to the imminent dangers which threaten our country, our race, and the Church of Christ in this land, more than they can sympathize with any other body of professed Christians in the nation; why shall we not see eye to eye, and join hand to hand, and heart to heart, in the one great work of our common Lord and Master? May we not ask this question of our brethren represented in the pages of the *Mercersburg Review*? Do we misunderstand them? Or, do they misunderstand us? Must we always remain, like oil and water, mixing, but not blending? brethren in name, yet uttering only notes of discord, and waging fratricidal war with each other? Again, we say, we rejoice that our own portion of the Church, in the "Memorial Movement," has extended the olive branch of peace; she has invited a free interchange of sentiment; she has done all that she can do, or ought to do, to heal the wounds of Zion; her watchmen have uttered their words of warning; and, in this regard, at least, the blood of souls will not be required at her hands.

And hence it is that we have examined the pages of this *History* of Dr. Schaff with no ordinary interest. For, as one of the Editors of the *Mercersburg Review*, we have sought in his *History* a solution of the difficulties which have all the while met us in reading the pages of his *Quarterly*. And we are free to say, we think we understand Dr. Schaff, both in his *Quarterly* and in his *History*. For an honest man, (and such we doubt not Dr. Schaff is,) in writing history will write it, or at least will attempt to write it, not make it. He is a scribe, not an author or creator. The *History* of the Church from the birth of Christ to the Reign of Constantine, (A. D. 1-311,) is, of all others, the very era where the historian, if he has any peculiarities in his theory of the Church, will be most sure to exhibit them. He may, like Mosheim, record facts simply; and then it is with his facts only that we have to do. Or he may, with Neander and most modern German Historians, write history from the stand-point of a certain theory; and then it is with

his theory also that we have to deal. We do not hesitate to say that Dr. Schaff writes the History of the Church during this most important period from the stand-point of a theory. Consciously or unconsciously, it shapes and colors his History. Indeed, his conception of the province of the Church Historian leads him of necessity to tinge, at least, his work with the peculiar hue of his own personal views. He says, "History has a soul as well as a body, and that the ruling ideas and general principles must be represented no less than the outward facts and dates."* We are to look, therefore, in Dr. Schaff's volume not only for facts and dates, but also for Dr. Schaff's understanding of the "ruling ideas and general principles" of the Church of Christ. Whether Dr. Schaff's conception of "the ruling ideas and general principles" of the Church is a true conception or not, is of course another and very distinct question from the question of his "facts and dates." And yet, as the "soul" is a good deal more important than the "body," so Dr. Schaff's notion of what the "ruling ideas and general principles" of the Church are, is, of course, the most important thing in looking at his History.

The period of the history of the Church which Dr. Schaff has embraced in this volume, is the great battle-ground of the Church. It was so at the Reformation. It is so now, and is to be so emphatically hereafter in the war with Rome and with Dissent. It is so, however, not in regard to its "facts and dates," for these are becoming so well known that men cannot, and we may say, dare not, write such nonsense as Dr. Miller, of Princeton, and President Hopkins, and the Rev. Lyman Coleman have been in the habit of ventilating. For such men have a reputation for truthfulness, at least, to maintain, if they have no conscience to appeal to. And the great facts in the early history of the Church are becoming so generally known that men must be more careful what they write. It is not these facts which are to be disputed; it is the use which is to be made of them, the interpretation which is to be put upon them, or, as Dr. Schaff says, "the ruling ideas and general principles" around which those facts are to be grouped.

Let us state this matter more clearly. If CHRIST in and through His Inspired Apostles established not only a Church but some particular Church, not only a Ministry but some particular Ministry, not only Sacraments but some particular Sacraments, not only a Christian Sabbath but some particu-

* Schaff's History, &c., Preface, page vi.

lar Christian Sabbath; if He gave not only a Word, and a Faith, but some particular Word and Faith, then the great question is, what that Church, and Ministry, and Sacraments, and Sabbath, and Word, and Faith, really are? How are we to know? By what rule are we to determine? There is a principle of authority somewhere here. Where is it, and what is it?

To this question, and it is the great question of the day, the Quaker answers that there are no binding, obligatory, external Forms in the Christian Dispensation. The Congregationalist says that while Forms, to a certain extent, are a good thing, yet that there are none which have a divine sanction; that everything is left to expediency. The Romanists, on the other hand, are at loggerheads with each other. They stick for authority; but they never have been able to tell where it is. Some say it is in the development of certain root ideas or principles first given to the early Church. Others claim that it resides as a perpetual legacy in the living Church; but where in the Church, they never have been able to agree. They boast of authority, and so of unity; but they never have been able to locate the authority; and so their unity is, after all, a sham.

The great rule binding all ages and times, on all these great questions of the Faith and Institutions of the Church, is, APOSTOLIC SANCTION; or the sanction of the strictly Apostolic Church. It is the Church as planted by Apostles specially called, appointed, and inspired by the HOLY GHOST to this very end. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you;" this was the charge which CHRIST gave them, showing that there were certain definite "things" to be observed, "even unto the end of the world;" and that these "things" were not anything, or some things, or nothing, but "ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER I HAVE COMMANDED YOU." (St. Mat. xxviii, 20.) And they had besides the special promise of the HOLY GHOST to teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever CHRIST had said unto them. (St. John xiv, 26.) Here is the principle, the root principle of the Church. What the Church then was, what the Faith then was, such Christ meant His Church and Faith to be, "unto the end of the world." This was the Church which He promised to be with; this was the Faith which His disciples went forth to preach. The bare statement of this rule carries its own demonstration with it; while its denial, and the substitution for it of either of the other principles which we have

mentioned, has resulted, we need not say, in the grossest fanaticism, infidelity, idolatry, and superstition. Of this, the world is full of living proofs. It is the great lesson for Christendom to learn, to accept the Church as Christ planted it, and the simple Facts of the Gospel as they are revealed. System-making, Church-wise, and Doctrine-wise, has been the sin and the curse of the Church in all ages from the very first.

This rule is perfectly practicable. The only question as to an Article of Faith, a Doctrine, or an Institution, is, has it Apostolic authority? For, be it remembered, *on this point of authority*, between the strictly Apostolic and the strictly post-Apostolic age, there is an unfathomable gulf. The Apostles were called, inspired, and sent forth to sustain this relation to the Church. On them the Church was "built." In teaching the Faith, they had, as we have seen, the special promise of the HOLY GHOST "to guide them into all Truth." Their mission lasted in the person of one or other of the Apostles down to nearly the beginning of the second century; and during this more than sixty years of strictly Apostolic guidance, the Church spread in its unity of Faith, Order, Ministry, and Worship, into all parts of the then known world. All that the earlier and purest subsequent ages of the Church could do, all the authority which the Fathers, or the Earlier Councils can claim in this regard, is to witness to the "Faith once delivered to the saints," to define that Faith against the Heresies which beset it.

Such is the rule by which we are to try all questions pertaining to the Church of Christ; her Faith, Ministry, Order, and Worship. What that Faith, Ministry, Order, and Worship are, is, of course, another and a distinct question. To meet this question, the later New Testament Scriptures of course are our guide. They teach, however, rather by recognition and by allusion than by commandment. Why it is that a "thus saith the Lord" is not found, for many things, and for all things held to be of divine and universal obligation, is a question which does not concern us in the present connection. What we have to do now, is with the fact that a positive enactment, a divine prescription, does not exist for Doctrines and for Institutions which by universal consent are vital to Christianity. And where the language of Holy Scripture upon such points is misunderstood or perverted, we are thrown at once for an interpretation of their meaning upon the practice of the Apostolic Church; and thus and there we learn beyond controversy how the Apostles themselves

understood their own language. We need not say that this was the ruling principle of the Anglican, in distinction from the Continental Reformation; it was Apostolic Practice *versus* Private Opinion, so called. And to meet such an appeal we are brought at once to the undoubted testimony and the History of the Primitive and Apostolic Church. For in that age of trial and of suffering, when the fires of martyrdom kept the Church pure, whatever of Doctrine and of Institution was taught "always, everywhere, and by all," could of necessity have had but one origin. And here it is that we see the importance of that period in the history of the Christian Church. Men sneer at the Fathers, and at patristic learning; but such men are simply stupid, or wicked, or both. They talk about the Scriptures; how do they know what the Canonical Books of the New Testament are?

We are prepared now to examine Dr. Schaff's "History of the Christian Church from the Birth of Christ to the Reign of Constantine." What are "the ruling ideas and the general principles" with which he has written the history of this most important era, and which have given color and shape to his historic statements? The great fault of Dr. Schaff is, that he has no clear, distinct conception, no strong, well-defined statement of the fundamental principles by which the history of the Apostolic Church must be interpreted. That principle of authority, that Rule of Doctrine and Institution, that "divine pattern" in Faith and Practice given by Christ, and by which the Apostles planted the Church, not for one age, but for all ages; of all this Dr. Schaff takes no cognizance. This great principle, of such infinite importance, he not only thoroughly ignores; but he ignores it in a manner which throws the whole argument into the hands of the Romanist. Take, for example, his Section on the "Germs of the Papacy." What does he mean by the "germs of the Papacy?" Does he mean that the Papacy was the natural development, the legitimate outgrowth of the principles of the Apostolic Church?—that the "germ" was now in its fruitage? He certainly does mean this, and he certainly teaches it. His ignoring the rule which we have already enunciated, forces him to teach it in spite of himself; and such will be the tendency of his work on the popular, ill-trained, ultra-Protestant mind of the age. Yet there was never a shallower specimen of sophistry in the world. Undoubtedly the *perversion*, not the development, the trampling upon, not the carrying out of the principle of Diocesan Unity, combined with external temptations, led in time to the establishment of

the Papacy. It was the abuse, not the use of an Apostolic principle. And that abuse, whatever else it may prove, proves that there was no distinctively Congregational or Presbyterian element in Apostolic times; for the tendencies of such an element are all in another direction. Had the Apostolic principle, not only of Diocesan Unity, but of Diocesan Independence also, been rigidly adhered to, the monstrous assumptions of the Papacy would never have been heard of.

And yet, although Dr. Schaff does not formally state the rule above announced, he does, by implication, sometimes rely upon it, as did Dr. Miller, and as does every Presbyterian when he is called to defend certain Doctrines and Institutions. They cannot defend them without it. Thus the divine appointment of the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath, the doctrine of Infant Baptism, the doctrine of the Trinity—in sustaining these essentials in the Christian System—these men are compelled to appeal to the testimony of the Apostolic Church. The argument is a good one; but if it is good for the use to which they put it, it is good for the Ministry and Worship of the Church, and for some other things besides. The "ruling ideas and the general principles" with which Dr. Schaff has written his History, are dreamy, mystical, loosely and even inconsistently defined, and are so stated, as we shall show presently, as that they may mean much, or little, or nothing. And here we have the key, not only to his History, but to that whole School of Theology of which we have been speaking. We think we understand now why it is that men, sometimes so superlatively "Churchly" in their theories and fancies, are yet in no small danger of being found most emphatically un-Churchly, in fact and in reality; and that men who on so many points seem, in word, to be wholly with us, will, not improbably, in the hour of action and of trial be found thoroughly against us.

The following is Dr. Schaff's conception of Apostolic Christianity:

"In virtue of this original purity, vigor, and beauty, and the amazing success of primitive Christianity, the canonical authority of the single but inexhaustible volume of its literature, and the infallibility of the Apostles, those inspired organs of the Holy Ghost, those untaught teachers of mankind, the Apostolic age has an incomparable interest and importance in the history of the Church. It is the immovable groundwork of the whole. It has the same regulative force for all the subsequent developments of the Church, as the inspired writings of the Apostles have for the works of all later Christian authors.

"Furthermore, the Apostolic Christianity is pre-formative, containing the living germs of all the following periods, personages, and tendencies. The whole history of the Church, past and future, is only the progressive analysis and application of principles and prototypes given in the New Testament; especially of the three leading representatives of the primitive age, Peter, Paul, and John."^{*}

If the reader is disposed to say that Dr. Schaff, in the above extract, is inconsistent with himself, that he both affirms and denies, that he has meaning, and has no meaning, in his definition of Apostolic Christianity, and that there is a vagueness in it peculiar to writers of the modern German type, and which passes with some people for wonderful profundity; we say, that if the reader chooses to express such an opinion of Dr. Schaff's definition of Apostolic Christianity, all that we have to reply is, that we give the definition as we find it, and that, when the reader has read and understood it, he will be prepared to read and understand the history itself. He will, perhaps, come to the conclusion which we confess forces itself upon us more and more as we trace the history and study the writings of these men, that "Mercersburg Theology" is the resultant of an attempt to combine in one System the most implicit Faith with the most daring intellectual Speculation. It is child-like belief, cramped and distorted by what Dr. Nevin, speaking of Germany, somewhere calls "the general disease of the country." If the whole thing is full of dazzling anomalies and paradoxes, if it is an enigma and a puzzle, and so an attraction to young and visionary minds; we may see reason why it should, for the time being, command attention, and yet never be able to prove an element of life and power in the religious history of our country. It is an exotic which will never flourish, though it may live, in such an uncongenial soil.

The Rev. Dr. Nevin, another prominent writer of this same School, and second to no man in it for influence, gives his definition of the Church as follows:

"The true sense of the Church Question, in this view, that which forms its proper nerve and gist, is not found really in those points, around which the controversy is most commonly made to revolve. The first matter needing to be settled, is, *not the right of any outward historical organization to be considered the Church or a part of the Church, but what the Church itself must be held to be in theory or ideal; not the force and value of any institution, or usage, or order, which may be set*

* Schaff's History, pp. 30, 31.

forward in any quarter as evidencing the presence of the Church, but what this presence in any case must be taken actually to involve and mean. * * * *The fundamental question is not of the sacraments, nor of a liturgy, nor of the Church year, nor of ordination and Apostolical succession, nor of Presbyters, Bishops, or Popes; but as we have said, of the nature of the Church itself, considered in its ideal character, and as an object of thought anterior to every such revelation of its presence in an outward way.*"*

We have italicized a part of this quotation, which really contains the gist of the whole matter. The reader, who is familiar with the peculiar terminology of German Philosophy, will see, at a glance, precisely what, and how much, such language really means. Of course, on everything pertaining to the Church, whether it be a point of Doctrine, or an Institution, these men would first instruct us as to their own anterior ideal conception, before we can be safely left to the teachings of the HOLY GHOST and the Practice of Inspired men. A Divine Institution, our knowledge of the nature of which is made dependent, not on the supernatural manifestation of such Institution, but on some anterior ideal conception of our own, cannot of course be affected by Scriptural or Apostolic testimony, be it what it may. But surely, the history of German Philosophy for the last twenty-five years, shows how definite our knowledge of the nature of the Church is likely to be under such guidance; and it enables us to see pretty clearly how much the cause of a really true Catholicity may reasonably hope for from such a School of Theology as that which we have been considering. The great difficulty with that theology is, it is based on a system of Philosophy the whole genius and spirit of which is radically and thoroughly speculative and un-Churchlike.

There is no part of his work where Dr. Schaff's peculiarities as a Church historian are more manifest than in his "Section" on the "Origin of the Episcopate." He thus states the question: "Was the Episcopate, directly or indirectly, of Apostolic (Johannean) origin, as the Catholics and the Anglicans, and in a modified sense also some of the recent Protestant divines of Germany, maintain? Or did it arise, as the Presbyterians and most Protestant historians assert, not till after the death of the Apostles, and develop itself from the presidency of the Congregational Presbytery?" On this question he pretends to give the leading points of the argu-

* *Mercersburg Review*, April, 1858, pp. 187, 188.

ment on both sides; although the argument for the Apostolic origin of Episcopacy is neither fairly nor fully stated. The conclusion to which he comes, or "seems" to come, for he speaks hesitatingly, is this: "that the Episcopate proceeded, both in the descending and ascending scale, from the Apostolate and the original Presbyterate conjointly, as a contraction of the former and an expansion of the latter, without either express concert or general regulation of the Apostles, neither of which, at least, can be historically proved. *It arose instinctively, as it were, in that transition period between the first and second centuries, probably before the death of John.*"* The italics are ours.

If he had said that the Episcopate existed, not "probably," but most certainly, before the death of the Apostle St. John; if he had reached and laid hold of the conception of the root principle, that the Apostolic Church was more than a mere model and pattern Church for future times; that it was that very organic, living Body of Christ, of which, as a positive existence, Christ is the Head, and through which, in all ages, He dispenses His Grace; if instead of a dreamy, transcendental, "ideal, anterior theory" about the Church, there were rather a childlike, loving reception of what Christ, in His wisdom, (not in ours,) has chosen to do, and to appoint, for the accomplishment of His own gracious purposes; there would be much less to find fault with, in the volume before us. The universal existence of Episcopacy, in its ordinary acceptance, as an Institution of the Church everywhere in the early part of the second century, as soon as authentic history throws any light upon the subject, Dr. Schaff of course is too intelligent a man to dispute. Chillingworth's statement of this argument, for point and clearness, has never been improved.

"When I shall see, therefore, all the fables in Metamorphosis acted, and proved true stories; when I shall see all the democracies and aristocracies in the world lie down and sleep, and awake into monarchies; then will I begin to believe that Presbyterial government, having continued in the Church during the Apostles' times, should presently after, (against the Apostles' doctrine and the will of Christ,) be whirled about like a scene in a mask, and transformed into Episcopacy. In the mean time, while these things remain thus incredible, and in human reason impossible, I hope I shall have leave to conclude thus:

"Episcopal government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the Church, presently after the Apostles' times.

* Mercersburg Review, pp. 419, 420.

"Between the Apostles' times and this 'presently after,' there was not time enough for, nor possibility of so great an alteration.

"And therefore, there was no such alteration as is pretended. And therefore Episcopacy, being confessed to be so ancient and Catholic, must be granted also to be Apostolic. *Quod erat demonstrandum.*"

In his treatment of ancient authors Dr. Schaff evidently aims at entire fairness. He admits the authenticity and genuineness of writings and documents on which the Church has always relied, and which leave us in no doubt as to the organization, Ministry, Sacraments, and Worship of the Early Church. Occasionally we find a slip which surprises us. Thus, in speaking of the "Angels" of the Apocalypse, he says, they "probably represent the whole corps of officers in the respective Churches of Asia Minor, as the responsible messengers of God to them." And yet he confesses that "if regarded as single persons"—and Dr. Schaff knows that the united voice of Catholic antiquity, and the opinion of the most learned non-Episcopal writers, agree that they were single persons—"they must be somewhat like the Bishops of the second century." He says, "We might call them Congregational Bishops, as distinct from the Apostles, and from Diocesan Bishops of later times." But pray, Dr. Schaff, what sort of a "Congregational Bishop" was the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, when we know that more than thirty years before, there were even then many Presbyters in that Metropolitan City? (Acts xx, 17.) We have called this a slip; for it is at variance with the general accuracy of statement as to matters of fact which characterizes his volume.

Our object in examining this work we trust is already accomplished. We have wished to show the place which Dr. Schaff's History occupies in a Church point of view; and we think we have also found, in his volume, a key to explain much which is mysterious and inexplicable in what is known as Mercersburg Theology, and in the anomalous position which it occupies, and the relations which it sustains in our country. We are willing these men should know precisely what impression their System makes upon us as American Churchmen. We have written with entire frankness, and as if for brethren, who will know how to appreciate it, and will thank us for it. The Church, in whose name and behalf we speak, has, we confidently believe, a glorious future before her. Small, comparatively, in numbers, she is already commanding the strong points of influence in our country; and her missionary pioneers are proving that she is not a Church for a class; but

the Church, for all. All eyes—patriots, philanthropists, Christians of all names, sick of empiricism and quackery, and novelties in Christianity and in morals—are turned more and more towards her, as being that element of true conservatism and true progress which the age demands. Still it is to be a future of desperate conflict: not, it may be, with carnal weapons; the trial is to be one demanding a truer heroism, the perilous trial of soft dalliances and treacherous compromises, where Satan is so transformed into an angel of light as to deceive, if it be possible, the very elect. Whether that future is to bring us and our Mercersburg brethren nearer together, or is to drive us still farther asunder, CHRIST, the great Head of the Church, only knows; and it is a question which He comprehends in all its momentous issues. For ourselves, we would so write, so counsel, so act, as that we at least may be safe in leaving that question in His hands.

Aside from the fundamental mistake which lies at the bottom of this work, as to the general merits of the History, *as a History*, we have said nothing, and do not intend now to speak at length. Mosheim, in his "Commentaries on the state of Christianity during the first three hundred and twenty-five years from the Christian Era," has covered the entire ground of this volume, and has written with a fullness and a depth of research which leaves little to be desired. In comparison with his masterly examination, the work of Dr. Schaff is but a compend. Indeed, the summary character of this new History is one of our principal objections to it; and yet, on the wide range of topics discussed, we know not where to find the same amount of matter within the same compass. On the struggles of early Christianity with the educated mind of that age, and especially with its Philosophy, the work is particularly rich. As to the recently discovered alleged work of Hippolytus, "The Philosophumena," which Chevalier Bunsen has done so much to bring before the public, it is, we think, of much less importance and value than Dr. Schaff seems to suppose. But into this subject we cannot now enter.

The following are the leading topics of examination in the volume: Preparation for Christianity, Founding and Growth of the Church, Apostolic Theology and Literature, Christian Life and Worship, Organization of the Apostolic Church, Spread of Christianity, Persecution of the Church and Christian Martyrdom, Literary Contest of Christianity with Judaism and Heathenism, Development of Church doctrine

in Conflict with Heresy, The Christian Life in Contrast with Pagan Corruption, Christian Worship, Organization and Discipline of the Church, The Church Fathers and their Writings.

We will not part with the work without saying that in several respects it possesses great merits, and that outside the circle of scholars and divines, in the spirit of whose philosophy it has been written, it cannot but exert a wholesome influence. We hope for it, in this regard, a wide circulation. There is a manly frankness in it, which will command respect; and it will correct popular mistakes, rebuke prejudices, and awaken in many minds new conceptions of the very principles, the whole genius and spirit of our holy Religion. Such a "Section," for example, as that on "The Catholic Unity," so nobly, and, with a single exception, so admirably expressed, will prove a corrective precisely adapted to the temper of our times. The well instructed Churchman will find in the work little that is new, much that he will disapprove, but an earnestness, freshness, and vigor, which he cannot but admire.

ART. II.—BISHOP EASTBURN'S THIRD CHARGE.

The Third Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Massachusetts, delivered in Trinity Church, Boston, on Wednesday, May 4th, 1859. "The Signal Work of the Holy Spirit in these United States." By the Right Rev. MANTON EASTBURN, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese. Boston: 1859. 8vo. pp. 23.

BISHOP EASTBURN'S Third Charge has just been laid upon our table. Like other Charges delivered periodically by our Right Reverend Fathers, and published to the world, it is to be ranked among the religious literature of the day, open to candid criticism, and liable to deserved censure, if delivered only in a suitable spirit, and with a becoming respect for the Office. In this temper we propose looking at the production now before us. We hope our examination of it will be fair, liberal, free from all prejudice and bitterness, and utterly devoid of all party spirit. If further apology for our examination were needed, we have it in the fact that the Charge has been scattered gratuitously all over the country, challenging public criticism, and aiming to mould, if it may, public sentiment. It is not with the Bishop of the Diocese of Massachusetts alone, therefore, that we have to do, but with the individual author's opinions also, and opinions uttered in a tone which certainly makes further apology unnecessary.

In general, we remark that this Charge bears no marks of ability. It seems to be a production of haste and hurried thought. As to style, it is stilted and pretentious, and filled with the mannerisms that abound in all the compositions of the same author. It would seem to be impossible for him ever to say a simple thing in a simple way. There is a straining after dignity, which too often reminds one of the "red patches" spoken of by the Prince of critics. This defect is all the more noticeable, from the contrast it presents to the beautiful simplicity belonging to the style of his venerable predecessor, whose writings are as free from this blemish as can well be imagined. Bishop Griswold's style was singularly pure and simple. One of the finest judges of composition we have ever known, said that Bishop Griswold wrote the best English that he had ever read, and, often as he appeared in public, never fell into a strain of mere religious declamation.

This is specially true respecting Bishop Griswold's Charges, which are marked by deep practical piety, ripe wisdom, discriminating thought, enlarged charity, and elevating Christian sentiments. We sincerely wish all this could be said of the Charge now under examination. But critical truth compels us to confess, that scarcely any of it rises above respectable religious declamation, fitted well enough for Bishop Eastburn's conference meetings, but unsuited to an Episcopal Charge, where we have a right to look for a higher range of thought.

We sincerely hope that all he says of the work of Grace, with which God has been pleased to bless our land, is true. Nor is there any subject about which we would speak with deeper reverence, or more heartfelt praise to Almighty God, than that of the pouring out of His Holy Spirit for the conversion of man, and the causing of a "deep and wide revival of a living faith in Christ working by love, and bringing forth all the fruits of the Spirit." We desire this, as the highest of all blessings to a ruined world. But, to us, the Bishop seems to discourse of it in a strain of lofty exaggeration, and we trust he will pardon us, if we say further, that his language does not impress us with his deep faith in the reality of the thing. It is rather the language which we should expect to hear from the rostrum, where a speaker had a topic assigned him that he must make the most of, but, being destitute of exact information, and conscious of having little to say, he feels bound to work up every idea to produce the best oratorical display, and seeks to atone by turgid expressions for what he lacks in force of thought. Of this, there is, indeed, a great lack. Page after page consists of a series of truisms and common-places, which weary the reader. We look in vain for anything new and original, anything that gives proof of earnest thinking. Much of it is a stringing together of religious phrases, which seem to be uttered by rote, and wear a good deal the aspect of mere cant. In a production, where we look for the utterances of matured wisdom, enlarged views, broad charity, and a generous catholicity of spirit, our expectations are here sadly disappointed.

It may be said, however, is not your standard too high? How can you look for much force and originality of thought in a man burdened with the care of a city parish, in addition to those belonging to the Episcopate? And we reply, as Yankees, by asking another question, Who *put* these cares of a parish upon the Bishop, or who keeps them clinging to him? Are they not self-imposed? He seems to think himself able to take charge of a parish, and to perform the duties

of the Episcopate besides. But in this over-estimate of his ability, we have abundant reason for believing that he stands alone. We doubt if there be a single person in the Diocese who accords with him in this belief. All would be glad to have him devote the powers God has given him to the exclusive duties of his high Office, as none too much to meet its claims and responsibilities. And the opportunity of doing this has been generously offered him, by the efforts of a distinguished layman in the western part of the Diocese, which, however, was resolutely declined. With what propriety, then, can the onerous cares of a parish be urged as an excuse for decided failure in his Episcopal efforts? He chooses to impose upon himself duties beyond his power to discharge satisfactorily. For this whom has he to blame but himself? We mention these things because it is due to the Diocese that the state of its affairs, *in this respect*, should be known. We are not disposed to bind heavy burdens upon him, which we refuse to touch with one of our fingers. So far from this, we have been ready not only to touch them with our fingers, but also to put our shoulders to the task of relieving him; but he resolutely persists in carrying burdens so far beyond his ability, and leading to so many mortifying results.

The defects which we have already mentioned are not, however, the worst faults of this Charge. We could put up with its feebleness, its mannerism, its declamation, its marks of hurried, immature thought, were it not so perfectly un-Church-like, and uncharitable in spirit, and were not the tone of it throughout too much, "I am right and everybody else is wrong," I am "Evangelical," all who differ from me are formalists, whose teachings are mere "ceremonialism;" who "put the Saviour into the background," and offer as "substitutes for Him something which it would be hard to say whether they are most ludicrous or most cruel." Of one thing we are certain, we are at a loss to know whether it be most "ludicrous" or most contemptible for a Bishop to utter such language, and to discourse to his Presbyters in such a strain of denunciation, unless he desire to set the Diocese in a blaze. For he may be well assured that this imperious treatment of all who differ from him will not long be tolerated. The hour of retribution will certainly come. The language of rebuke, to be effective, and to be anything else than an insult, must always presuppose, in the censor, a certain *moral status*, not put on, but tacitly recognized on all hands.

What, have we come to this? Shall a man of moderate

talents, of mediocre attainments in theology, and less logic, assume to be the model which all others are to trim their Theological opinions by? Shall he use the prerogatives of his Office to crush those who venture to differ from him in ecclesiastical views? Shall he avail himself of his high position, and hiding behind a set of evangelical phrases which may mean anything or nothing, from thence hurl his missiles at those who may perchance differ from himself in their conception of certain doctrines and duties, who may cherish higher and more reverential views of the Sacraments than he holds? Shall he employ the opportunity of delivering a Charge, for the purpose of denouncing his honest opponents in Church views; treating them with reproach and contumely, as men who uphold a "system of superstition," inculcate a "delusive formalism," favor "Popish worship," and "Priestly mediation," and, what is the severest of all censure, and the most cutting of all reproach, "*put the Lord Jesus into the shade,*"* and mock mankind by offering to hearts which are under conviction, a "stone for bread," and a "serpent for a fish!" Surely this is not to be tolerated, "no, not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel may continue with us." And is it not high time, frankly and firmly to tell him so? If he chooses to maintain lower views of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, let him do so on all proper occasions, by fair argument, by sound Scriptural logic, and with all the force and eloquence that he can command. On a fair field, we shall not whine at any blow he can give, or any victory he can achieve. We like a fair, open contest, if contest it be, in which good, honest, sturdy blows are given and received. But if others choose to follow the older, more common, and, as they deem, better methods of doing the Church's work in their several parishes; if they maintain, in their judgment, truer views of the blessed Sacrament of the Supper;

* While the above accusation is before our eye, we deem it proper to cite a passage emanating from one who is probably regarded by Bishop Eastburn as the very impersonation of the system which he assails, and which he charges with the awful sin of "putting the Lord Jesus into the shade."

"The truth, the whole truth, is this: Christ in the Sacraments, Christ in Confirmation, Christ in Holy Absolution, Christ in the Offering of the Daily Morning and Evening Sacrifice, Christ in the Word preached, Christ in the Ministrations to the Sick, Christ in the Teaching of the Penitent, Christ in the Sacred Institution of Matrimony, the type of His own union with his Church, and Christ, (for is He not the Resurrection and the Life?) Christ in the Burial of the Dead: this, this only, this entirely, is the unadulterated, the uncrippled, the whole, the sound theology of the Church."—CHRIST IN HIS ORDINANCES. A Sermon preached in King's Chapel, Boston, by Rt. Rev. HORATIO SOUTHGATE, D. D., July 11, 1858.

if they have a more appreciating sense of Christ's presence therein, and cherish more adoring gratitude for the spiritual benefits which it confers upon the believing partaker, it is not for the Bishop, as we before said, to hide behind a set of Evangelical phrases, and from thence to utter his denunciation against those whose views differ from his own, as if for this reason they must be heretical and soul-ruining.

From these general remarks, which we have made in no spirit of cavil or love of contradiction, but with a sincere desire of promoting the "truth as it is in Jesus," and from a conviction that it would be a "spurious charity" for us to allow this Charge to go forth, without an effort to furnish some antidote to its errors, let us now turn to the subject-matter of it. The first part is devoted to pointing out "the remarkable features of the religious movement," manifested during the past year, throughout our country, and for which he expresses his gratitude to Almighty God. In this we are happy to join him. We lift our voice of praise with his, to the Giver of all Good, for every indication of the Presence of the Holy Spirit for the conversion and sanctification of men. What he says of the *features* of this work of Grace, we shall not dispute. We devoutly hope it is all true; and we earnestly pray that the "work" may abound more and more. In the second part he mentions "the *encouragements* which this work of Grace addresses to the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States." These are two. The first is, "that we possess in our Liturgy a form of words which is so eminently in harmony with the spiritual condition of the people." This is, no doubt, true. It is a pleasing fact, that our noble, scriptural Liturgy does furnish all that a people can need, when most deeply awakened to a sense of their spiritual wants, and are anxiously asking the question, what they shall do to be saved. To souls burdened with sin, and seeking relief in Divine Mercy, what is there to be compared with our Liturgy, in holding up the fullness and sufficiency of Christ's Atonement, and pointing out clearly the way of salvation for the guilty through Him? What is there which presents the Gospel in a manner so adapted to meet all the wants of those who feel godly sorrow for sin, and desire to be led as penitents to the foot of the Cross? And when the people are in this spiritual condition, when there is a prevailing and deep interest felt among men to secure the blessings of the Gospel, and to "gain" that "peace which the world cannot give," the Bishop admits—and we hail the admission—that "there is no degree of sorrow for transgression—no extent of desire after some Mediatorial defense to stand between

offending man and offended God, which does not find a response in the Prayer Book, in those scriptural services through which we lead the congregation. It is the gospel here—it is the gospel there—it is the gospel everywhere—distinct and full—anthem—creed—petition—humiliation—thanksgiving—all speak one language, most in unison with all the emotions of an awakened heart, because it is the simple phraseology of the Bible, expressing those simple truths which that same Bible reveals." All this is eminently true, and it is refreshing to see such a statement.

In this connection there is another remark, which we hail with equal pleasure. He says, "We often hear complaints made by those who are outside of our fold, of the frigidity and stiffness of our ritual. One thing, however, I doubt not, that you have always found; that where there was a shallowness of religious character among our brethren of other names, these complaints were always the loudest; and that, on the other hand, where there was the profoundest sense of sin, and the warmest fire of love towards Him, who bore our transgressions in His own Body on the tree, and the clearest apprehension of the Gospel, there our form of words was the most thoroughly appreciated and loved." This is capital. Nothing could be truer or better expressed. It is a forcible testimony given to the spirituality and "adaptedness of the Prayer Book to the present state of things, when so many, feeling self-condemned, are unfortunately asking what they shall do to be saved." These are his words, and we hope that all those who are "outside of our fold," as well as many inside of it, will read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest them to their soul's health.

But, alas! for the inconsistency of man! In the face of these wholesome truths—in the face of all this proper laudation of the Prayer Book, and distinct admission that our "Liturgy furnishes *all* that the most burdened souls need," that "it is the gospel here—the gospel there—the gospel everywhere"—that "creed, prayer, confession, anthem, are in unison with all the emotions of the most awakened heart," because in them "Christ is evidently set forth"—in the face of all these admissions, he immediately proceeds to mention the second encouragement which "we of the Protestant Episcopal Church may take to ourselves, in connection with the present work of the Spirit." And what, gentle reader, suppose you this to be? Why, of course, you reply, it must be to use more faithfully that Prayer Book, which he so justly eulogizes as containing such a treasure of spiritual blessings, *sui*ted to all the wants of

the most awakened heart, to follow out that Prayer Book in the Order of its Daily Morning and Evening Service, to imbue more and more the hearts of the people with the chastened spirit of its deep devotion, and to bring out into full exercise the whole spiritual power of that remarkable Book, which is so "entirely in unison with all the emotions of an awakened conscience." But no, this is not the encouragement, namely, that we possess such a Liturgy ready at hand, and should use it more diligently than ever. On the contrary, the "encouragement which we of the Protestant Episcopal Church have in the present revival of religion throughout our land," is "the order, propriety, and Christian dignity of those more informal and social meetings of our people, which, since the present interest began, have been held for united and EXTEMPORANEOUS prayer."

This, then, is the encouragement held out by the Bishop. Having expatiated upon the present revival and told us of the outpouring of God's Spirit, and reminded us of the superior excellence of the Prayer Book, and of its fullness and sufficiency to satisfy all the spiritual needs of the sin-burdened and the inquirer after salvation through a Divine Redeemer, and of its Liturgy, in unison with all the emotions of the most awakened heart, he gravely and deliberately mentions as an incentive to work, in the present state of increased attention to religion, that we throw aside our Prayer Book, and resort to meetings for *extemporaneous* prayer and lay exhortation. But what an encouragement! Does he intend to mock us? Having held up the Prayer Book to our admiration, and extolled our Liturgy as so eminently adapted to meet the spiritual wants of our fellow men, at a time of refreshing from above, when God is granting His Holy Spirit, he tells us to lay it aside, and instead of a more sedulous use of that Book, to forego this advantage which we possess, and adopt a mode of worship which is dying out throughout all the land of its own inanity, and which the Sects themselves are rejecting as the driest of all forms; and all this as the best means of promoting "the conversion of the impenitent, and the increase of the life of God among his professed people." "Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph." Here is a Bishop who "thanks God for the adaptedness of the Prayer Book to the present state of things," which he has been describing, and in the same breath advises his Presbyters to give up that Prayer Book, and resort to holding "meetings, in which laymen and clergymen may pour

forth *extemporaneous* prayer, for the extension of the Gospel, the conversion of men," &c. But, as if resolved to carry his inconsistency to an extent that stultifies himself, while discarding the Prayer Book and its Services, in favor of meetings for extemporaneous prayer and exhortation, he yet admits, that what is good and desirable in those meetings is to be traced to "the subduing influence of our ritual upon the whole Christian character, and the gentleness, reverence, and chastized fervor which it imparts to religion." But why not have, then, *more* of that blessed influence? Why cut off from the worshipers, in those meetings, any of the hallowed effects of the Ritual? Why not have that Ritual shed its entire and full-orbed influence upon the souls of the worshipers? Why resort to a system, liable, in the end, to every objection which can be urged against a Liturgy; and a system, whose marked characteristic is, that it ministers to the spiritual pride and self-sufficiency of those who use it?

Here an observation forces itself upon our attention. When in this Charge the Bishop descants so laudatorily upon the Prayer Book, and holds up its Liturgy as so adapted to souls burdened by sin and seeking deliverance, when he speaks of that Liturgy as meeting the spiritual wants of such as desire frequent seasons of supplication, how natural it would seem to have been, for him to take this occasion to do tardy justice to two Churches in the city of Boston, which for years have, by their Daily Prayers, Morning and Evening, and by fully carrying out the Rubrics of the Prayer Book, developed the spiritual power of that Book, and the rich resources it contains for supplying the religious wants of men, for cherishing the spirit of prayer, and for creating a desire and appetite for frequent seasons of supplication! Respecting one of these, we may say that probably no Church has done more to bring out the power of the Prayer Book, and create a deep and abiding interest in its noble, elevating, and spiritual Service. No Church has so clearly shown the exhaustless wealth of our Ritual, when its design is fulfilled and the whole compass of its varied devotion is fairly tried. How natural, under the circumstances, to have pointed to so worthy an example, and to have held it up as deserving of imitation by all who in the spirit of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, are inquiring what they can do to supply more abundantly the deep spiritual wants of men, and set forward the work of Grace in the hearts of those who are inquiring the way to Zion, with their faces thitherward! But, instead of this, he discards the Prayer Book and its Liturgy, as failing to meet

the moral and religious necessities of the soul, during a time of "refreshing from the presence of the Lord," and commends meetings for *extemporaneous* prayer; as if, forsooth, these were the grand instrumentalities for "drawing forth the hearts of men in united supplication, and bringing down rain from the opened windows of heaven."

This Charge suggests several other remarks, some of which we shall here venture to make. The Bishop urges upon his Clergy to commence those assemblies for prayer, in which people may give "utterance to their desires in *unpremeditated* language." This he thinks will be "prolific of blessings;" nay, "certainly" will be, he says. Why? we have a right to ask. For it is mere assertion, without the shadow of reason to support it. Why has prayer in unpremeditated language such power with God? If it be so, let us employ it always, for what we want above all things is to reach the ear of the Giver of all good. But this, according to the Bishop's assertion, is more effectually done by uttering our desires in language suggested by the impulse of the moment, than in a prescribed form of sound and Scriptural words. And the idea of "setting on foot" all over the Diocese these "familiar assemblies," in which men may "give utterance to their desires in *unpremeditated* language," fills him with such ecstasy of feeling, that he breaks forth suddenly into prayer—"May the Lord raise up through every portion of the Diocese companies of earnest and praying men!" What he means, in this short litany, is, that the Lord would raise up men, who, under the influence of a little excitement, can pray better without the aid of our holy, beautiful and spiritual Liturgy, than with it. To such, forsooth, these "earnest and praying men" are confined. Does he really mean, that Forms of Prayer are fatal to earnestness? And on the supposition that such men can be found, he proceeds with his litany, "And may God put it into your hearts to encourage their intercessions for a dying and thoughtless world," i. e., the "intercessions" of those who think they can, off-hand, make better prayers than are to be found in the Prayer Book. Only do this, encourage such, and "your hands will be strengthened. Your field of labor will be refreshed with dew from heaven." Such is the way a Bishop discourses to his Presbyters! To us it sounds very like solemn nonsense. "Gratiano speaks an infinite deal of nothing; more than any man in all Venice. His reasons are as two grains of wheat, hid in two bushels of chaff. You shall seek all day ere you find them; and when you have them, they are not worth the search."

There is one more remark, called forth by the concluding

part of the Charge. Through the previous portions, he has exhibited a degree of uncharitableness, which surprised and grieved us. He seems to have had before his mental eye some man of straw, at which he is ever thrusting his spear. What the phantasm is, we do not precisely know, though we infer from certain intimations, that it is some theological system, which he so intensely hates, that it cannot pass before his vision, but instantly

"A thousand fantasies
Begin to throng into his memory,
Of calling shapes, and beckoning shadows dire,
And airy tongues that syllable men's names
On sands, and shores, and desert wildernesses."

And what is very observable to the reader, and perplexing too, the phantasm is ever changing its form and appearance. His ideas, like Hamlet's, are confused.

"*Ham.* Do you see yonder cloud, that's almost in shape of a camel?

"*Pol.* By the mass, and 'tis like a camel, indeed.

"*Ham.* Methinks it is like a weasel.

"*Pol.* It is backed like a weasel.

"*Ham.* Or, like a whale.

"*Pol.* Very like a whale."

But whatever it be the Bishop is fighting with, he spares neither harshness of language nor bitterness of spirit. So much is this the case, that were a stranger, ignorant of the circumstances, to read the Charge, he would verily suppose, that an imperious prelate, feeling indignant at some dreadful error which had crept into his Diocese, were seeking to crush out its life with his Episcopal heel. But how surprised would he be to learn, that the evil conjured up in the Bishop's fancy, and regarded by him as so dire and soul-ruining, and denounced in such unmeasured terms of opprobrium, is *that* in Doctrine and Worship, which is held, and honestly and sincerely held, by some of the most devoted, earnest, laborious, exemplary, and we will say, successful Rectors in the Diocese; and also by many laymen, who are surpassed by none in the land, in practical godliness, reverent piety, charity, benevolence, zeal, and self-sacrificing devotion to the interests of humanity, and the building up of Christ's Holy Church!

Nor is it enough for him to vent his own anger and bitterness of spirit against what seems to us an evil that exists chiefly in his own diseased imagination, but he seeks to stir up the spirit of party strife in his Clergy, and to whet their zeal against the abettors of a system which he disingenuously

caricatures. Hence he guards them solemnly against a "driveling charity"—urges them "to forswear a false tenderness"—admonishes them to "abjure a weak and unmanly spirit, that looks with a lenient eye upon" these different views cherished by their brethren of the same Household of Faith, and incites them "to maintain, at all times, and all places, an uncompromising hostility" to what he has represented as error, and which really means all that is antagonistic to his own private views. True, he afterwards does pour one drop of oil upon the troubled waters. After having said enough to awaken all the bitterness of the human heart, he has the grace to add, now in this contest to which I summon you, do not fight with "bitter and violent personality." Do not fight merely for "the sake of division." Remember that "the wisdom which is from above is first *pure*, then peaceable;" all of which seems to us like the conduct of a demagogue, who, having stirred the populace to phrenzy, and "fooled them to the top of their bent," then, just as their passions are about to burst forth into acts of violence, stops them, to say, "now do not be needlessly cruel; kill not merely for the sake of shedding blood; do not burn up your enemies in their beds; but give them warning, before you tear down their houses over their heads."

There is one portion of this Charge, and one evidently regarded by its author as not the least important, to which we shall only briefly allude. We refer to the Bishop's pointed and violent rebuke of that fraternal spirit of unity and concord which is more and more breathing over the heart of the Church, and which is already restoring among us harmony of counsel and of action. That certain factious men should strive to fan the embers of discord, is of course to be expected; but that a Bishop of the Church of God, in a day and age like this, should deal out such epithets, and, as far as lieth in him, keep alive and stir up hatred and alienation among brethren, his own sons in the Faith, ministering at the same altar, and in as good standing as himself, is a spectacle as painful as it is mortifying! We cannot but exclaim, "*tantæne animis celestibus iræ?*" If there is heresy in the Church, if there is violation of Ordination vows, we will go with him who goes farthest, if need be, to vindicate the Church's honor. But if, with at most only allowable differences of opinions, men are "bearing the burden and heat of the day," let them at least have the sympathy of cheering and encouraging words. "There is a day coming," when, under the constraining motive of a common forgiveness, we shall all look more kindly upon each other.

ART. III.—OUR DOMESTIC MISSIONARY SYSTEM.

1. *Report of the Domestic Committee, Oct. 4, 1858.*
2. *Mr. Francis Wharton's Letter to Bishop H. W. Lee, on Domestic Missions.* Philadelphia: 1858. 8vo. pp. 40.

THE most gratifying sign at present of the vitality of the Church, and of her re-awakening to her true position as the instrument of our Lord and Saviour for the conversion of the world, is the Missionary spirit everywhere apparent. Our Church publications have been full of suggestions and expedients to make the Missionary organization more effective. The discussions, Reports and Resolutions of our Diocesan Conventions bear witness to a wide-spread sense of our duty, and attempt to realize it; and much interest was felt in the Report of the Committee on modifications in our Missionary system, expected at the Annual Meeting of the Board of Missions at Baltimore in October last. Towards the preparation of that Report, many suggestions have already been made. Perhaps it was as well to take plenty of time in maturing it; the continuance of the Committee gives opportunity for a further discussion in advance. The subject is so important that we offer no apology in again presenting it at some length to the readers of the *American Quarterly Church Review*.

That there are defects in our present working has long been too apparent. Among the remedies suggested are the concentration of our energies upon "strong points"—the encouragement of "liberty of choice" in the agencies by which our Missionary offerings are dispensed—more stirring appeals to the Christian public—the use of every means to increase the offerings, and so increase the men. The principle which underlies all these suggestions, and the necessity which prompts them, is this: that the Church, the dispenser of the Gospel, is bound by the imperative rule of charity to furnish to the world that light, and knowledge, and warning, which it is one part of the wretchedness of the world to despise, and therefore to take no means to procure for itself. Our commission is, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." It is well for us when our Lord gives us such favor in the eyes of the people, that we need to provide neither

“shoes, nor scrip, nor money in our purse,” because the world recognizes that “the laborer is worthy of his hire:” but such was no promise of perpetual standing; it was revoked before “the agony in the garden,” and the Church is bound to support its servants while they labor for the good of the world. This, we say, is the principle of Missionary activity on the part of the whole Church; “Go ye!” The labor is to be ours, and the good the world’s; and therefore, either the labor of preaching, or the duty of giving to feed and clothe the preacher, is laid upon every partaker of the Grace of Christ. “Freely ye have received, freely give.” We have the Truth, and it is ours to the full extent of our ability to preach it to them who have it not; and therefore the question of our Missionary organization and operation is simply the question of economy, physical, mechanical, or political, as well as religious—how to obtain the greatest amount of power with the least expenditure of means.

Now the comprehension of our mission is necessary to know the power we want. We are *one Church*, sent to preach *one Faith to one world*; and just as far as we are enfeebled in means, or wasteful of them—as far as we hamper ourselves by shackles, or adulterate our principles by weakening concessions—we fall short of our high mission, and are either circumscribed in boundaries, or wanting in the strength of solidity. Thus, our efficiency is destroyed, and the results of our attainment fall short of the command put upon us. Such is now our position; throughout our own country and the world at large, unnumbered places are unoccupied, which ought to be and must be filled, before we fulfill the commission,—“Preach the Gospel to every creature.” For eighteen hundred years that mandate has been written for our reading, and at no time during all that period has the fullness of the command been obeyed. Events are indicating changes of the greatest significance in the moral world as near at hand; yet when and how our Lord shall come is hidden as at the first.

The analysis of our position as *one Church*, preaching *one Faith to one world*, leads us to three conditions of our Missionary action. First, that Faith is a matter, the purity and importance of which, the Church, and not the world, is the judge. Secondly, that the minister or agent in preaching the Truth, must be subordinate and responsible to the Church, as fulfilling her mission, and not to the world, as considering what it wishes, and thinks, and desires. Thirdly, that there be no obstacle in the way of preaching to every person who has a soul to be saved. That is to say, translating these proposi-

tions into practical language—first, a definite Faith, unchangeable, clear, and fully apprehended; secondly, such an independence of the worldly-minded and the wicked as will enable the Minister to fear or respect nothing but the Divinely constituted authorities of the Church; thirdly, a Church open for all, high or low, rich or poor, to come and hear the glad tidings. When we have secured these things, a Ministry spiritually minded enough to apprehend the Faith, and, as supported by the Church, in position independent of the world, and also the open doors for every one to come into the temple and listen, to come to the Ark and be saved, we have placed the Missionary in such a position that none of his power need be wasted, and the resolution of the other part of the problem of expansion only depends on the liberality of God's people, and their appreciation of their duty.

But here, perhaps, it may be well to anticipate a question likely to be urged. "Do you object to any aid of the Church in its Missionary operations by means gained from the world?" Not at all. But we do object to the individual Minister being so left to the world for aid, that he is liable to be brought under judgment to the world; and, while he is bound to the authority of the Bishop and the Church on the terms of the Church, that he shall be also bound to the support of the world on the terms of the world. Let the world aid the Church as much as it will, when it cannot swerve it from its duty; the meek are promised the possession of the earth; but the individual soldier is defenseless, unless he is guarded by the moral force of the army in which he is a standard-bearer. This may be enough for the present; a fuller answer will be found before we are through with what we have to say. In view of the everywhere expressed want of a more efficient Missionary system, we shall briefly define certain principles which, in our judgment, must govern our Missionary organization. Our view is restricted to the Domestic field, since the principles which we advocate are already carried out in the Foreign Stations.

No scheme of Missions will be comprehensive enough, none of our operations will rise to the full height of the command imposed, unless their broad foundation be the principle that *the Church*, as such, is CHRIST'S MISSIONARY SOCIETY. We may have Missionary Societies, voluntary or authorized, in the Church, and they may be very useful in their way, and as far as they go. But the whole Church must view itself as a great Missionary body. She is such by the very language of her charter. Societies and organizations, other than the

Church, are useful for concentrating activity upon certain objects; but the whole organization of the Church itself is the one great Society to perform this specific labor. It was so intended by our Lord. The spread of the Gospel was not to be merely or mainly by the instrumentality of books, but of men. Such was our Lord's provision, in the institution of His Church, with its Apostles, and Evangelists, and Pastors and Teachers, at a time when all the world was the field for what we now call Missionary action. Such, too, is the Institution which is to continue, until every one is gathered in; for as the wants and needs of men are the same in all ages, so the provision to meet those wants must be the same, and the Church must preserve the same character with which it was first instituted, itself *the Missionary Society*, "whose field is the world," whose duty is to pluck man as a brand from the burning, and to keep him till the day of the Lord Jesus.

The relation of the Church to mankind, therefore, is twofold; first, as gathering them from without; second, as protecting, guarding, and teaching them when brought within her fold. The first relation is the *Missionary*, the second the *Pastoral*. The one has as the subjects of its action the unbaptized and unconverted. The other has the baptized and the communicants. In the one relation, the Church's business is to change the whole current of thought and feeling, which sets earthward till it runs heavenward; neither more nor less than to work, under the Grace of God, a complete moral and spiritual revolution. In the other relation, its business is to build up disciples in their most holy Faith. The subject of the *Missionary* action of the Church has not received the Faith, nor professed himself bound to it. He is alien from the covenant, and governed by the thoughts and maxims of the world that is at enmity against God. He therefore has no right to be a judge of God's truth, or to control in God's Church. The Church comes to him, like Ezekiel the prophet, with a message to deliver, whether he will hear or whether he will forbear, and that message is one which requires in him an entire change, before he can be acceptable to God. But, in the *Pastoral* relation, the convert brought into the Fold of the Church has received the Faith; he professed at his Baptism its everlasting obligation, as well as his resolution of obedience to God's commandments, and solemnly renounced all the works of the devil, the world and the flesh. He therefore has become a part of the Church; like every other member, clerical or lay, is interested in the preservation of the doctrine, the purity of the discipline, and the solemnity of the

worship. He is pledged to it, and is therefore trustworthy under those pledges, which define the extent of his action, and which furnish a rule by which he himself may be judged, should he attempt innovation or corruption. To him, therefore, the custody of the Faith has been committed, and since it has been committed to him, he must have a certain degree of power in the Church to execute his commission. St. Paul, writing to the Galatians, gives two tests of the Gospel: "that which *we* have preached," and "that *ye* have received." The meeting of these tests is when the Church asks the candidate for Baptism, "Dost thou believe?" and the answer is, "I do;" the Church then propounds "that which it has preached," and the candidate professes that that is it, "which he has received." Between the Ministry commissioned by Christ to preach, therefore, and the Laity who have the duty to continue in "that they have received," the power in the Church is divided. Now, power to be permanent must be of the essence of the Church, and therefore consists in an ability to give or withhold something without which she cannot exist. Without a Ministry she cannot exist; and, in like manner, without the means of support, the Ministry cannot give their whole time to the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. The power of Ordination inherent in the Episcopate, the fountain of Ministerial authority, gives to the Ministry the instrumentality by which to do their part in preserving hereafter that which heretofore "they have preached;" while the coöperative principle inhering in the Laity gives them their influence in the preservation of "that they have received." There is thus a mutual check on the part of both Orders, by which the purity of the Gospel is preserved. There is a Ministry of Apostolic authority; and there is the dependence of that Ministry for coöperation and for support upon those, and those only, who are subjects of the Church's pastoral care. Hence the distinction of our congregations into the Pastoral, the Parish, and the Missionary, the Station.

It will be perceived that we have here a broad distinction between the two modes of action of the Church, the Missionary and the Pastoral. Every Clergyman of the Church, in his relation to the world, the unconverted, and the unbaptized, is as much a Missionary as if he was in India or China; inasmuch as the inhabitants of those pagan lands differ in no way, except in degree, from the unbaptized in more civilized countries. The un-Christian poet, or professor, the aristocrat of learning and civilization, in the eye of the Church, "looking not at the things which are seen," is as truly an alien

from the Kingdom of God, as the poor negro who falls down before his idols on the shores of Africa. Wheresoever, again, there is a baptized person pledged to the vows which the Church requires, there is the subject of her Pastoral care; and, in like manner, to whatsoever man or woman, nay, to whatsoever little infant, the Church administers the holy Sacrament of Baptism in the costliest temple, to these she has come as a Missionary, and all the instruction and warning, and exhortation and pleading that preceded the baptism of the adult, or the Faith that brought the infant to Christ, were as truly Missionary operations as the teaching of the expatriated Missionary in a foreign tongue, and to people of another color.

The Missionary work of the Church, therefore, is never done, so long as generations are born to take the place of those who die. We are all Missionaries to the sinner, the unconverted, the unbaptized; we have a *Mission*—are “sent” to them. And, since the labor of teaching and persuading is concentrated in the person of the Clergyman, it is our duty to make such provision for the Clergy, that their power shall be exerted to the full extent, and as shall permit no waste. He must have the support and hearty coöperation of the Laity, so long as he is approved by the standards to which he is sworn, and is faithful in the discharge of his duty. Nor is there any difference in principle in this respect between the “self-supporting” Parish, and the Missionary Station. The one, to speak in the language of political economy, is only a Station in which the production equals the consumption. The Church in that Parish supports its Minister; first, indeed as a Pastor over itself; but, also, as a Missionary to the world. The *Missionary*, however, has the same title to a support; not from the *localized* Church of that particular spot, for there there is none; but from “the Holy Church throughout all the world.” We insist upon this, because we think that much of the inefficiency complained of in our Missionary operations, and our slow progress in building up congregations of devout believers, has arisen from an ignoring of this principle, and from the attempt to spread our resources over too great fields, while we have left the Missionaries too much at the mercy of the world. The Romish Missions, and the Methodist Missions, both of which are eminently successful in their way, are based upon this fundamental principle. This strictly representative character, on the part of its accredited agents, is adhered to in all successful corporate bodies, even of a worldly nature. It is only in the Church that we ignore it, as of no importance. If, where the healthy sentiment of the self-supporting congregation helps the Minister, he

is supported by the Church and not by the world, surely there is the more need in the waste places of civilized heathenism that the Missionary, unsustained by the moral force of a congregational public sentiment, shall not be forced to appeal to those for his support who, if they give at all, will give only on their own motives, and for their own purposes, and who will demand of the Clergyman to respect those motives and purposes, however contrary to the Gospel they may be.

Hence we have the two ways in which the Missionary is, or should be, supported; first, by the self-supporting congregation in the firmly established Parish, whose Rector he is; and, second, by the Church at large, through its more distinctively Missionary Organization, in the Missionary Station, where the Communicants are too few for self-support, and consequently for self-government. To furnish men, therefore, in this latter field, fully competent for their labor is the only way to meet the first condition of the economical problem. How to secure the least expenditure of means, is a more difficult question. Our present and ineffective system is, to save as much money as possible by calling in auxiliary funds gathered from the places to which the Missionaries are "sent." But it will still be a question, and is a very grave one, whether there be not a vast waste of power, moral power, and material power also, in thus making our Missionaries dependent on the world. It may, and we believe does, require the exertion of more force to remove the impediments which such a policy puts in its own way, than is generated by the pecuniary means derived from this extraneous source. If, however, that auxiliary means could be turned into the channel of supply, as we believe it could, in such a way as not to impede, a great accession of power might be gained by the same expenditure. For, at present, power is lost in two ways; one, by not supplying sufficient means to enlist all the energies of the Missionary; the other, by increasing the resisting power, through working at a disadvantage. In other words, loss of power comes by diminished strength within, and by increased resistance without. To give the world the slightest control over the Church, is, as every Western Missionary can testify, to weaken our power in both ways, by diminishing the uncompromising application of our own principles, and by giving the world a hold for its resisting action against us.

Self-support implies self-government, and gifts imply authority. This is a great principle of natural justice. The Bishop, by the gift of Ordination, obtains authority over the ordained; the Layman, as well by his membership in the

Church as by the gift-money, obtains authority over the action of the Church. Here is the principle which draws the line between the strictly Missionary Station and the self-supporting Parish, in their relation to the Church at large. The fundamental idea of Missionary operations, we said, is that the Church is to furnish all, and expect nothing, until the Parish becomes self-sustaining. The subject of Pastoral care is bound to contribute to the extent of his ability, and is entitled to his voice in the self-government of the Church. It is true that in the mutations of human affairs, the line cannot be so distinctly drawn; but there will be men identified with the Church, and perhaps of considerable influence therein, who are of the world; and again, in those places where the operation of the Church is in spirit altogether Missionary, there will be members of the Church, who, on a rigid application of the theory, will temporarily be disfranchised of their rights. Still, if these men have the true spirit of their Master, they will never desire to overrule the wisdom of the Bishop and the Standing Committee, or other Ecclesiastical authority to whom the care of the Missionary field is committed; it is better that that franchise be yielded up to them, than to the world. Nor, on the other hand, can it be supposed that we shall get to working so perfectly, in the best state of the Church, that in the self-supporting Parish all worldly influence will be entirely excluded. In mechanics there is always a margin left for friction, and yet the mathematics are as carefully studied as if capable of the most rigid application. Where the Pastoral relation predominates, the Parish may be considered, in respect of support, exclusively Pastoral; where the Missionary relation predominates, it must be looked upon, in an economical point of view, as altogether Missionary. The practical test, therefore, of the classification into one or the other division will be the capacity for self-support. In the one case, the Missionary activity will be dependent on the Church's inward government of itself; in the other it will be dependent on its policy toward those without. The one, as a community, has an interest in "that it has received," which implies a certain responsibility in preserving it; the other has as yet received nothing, therefore has no interest in preserving anything.

On the part of the Church at large, therefore, a different policy must be pursued towards each of these two classes of congregations. The one is to be admitted to all the rights necessary for the working of a federal body, such as the visible Church is, in order to preserve the Faith from usurpation by

any class within ; the other, *as a class*, ought to be as jealously excluded, that there be no invasion from without. In the self-supporting Parish, the Missionary operations will be independent of the world, but dependent on the working of the Parish, and controlled by the authorities of the *Parish*, Clerical and Lay ; and the Clerical instrumentality will be rightly designated by the elective method. But at the Missionary Station—where the operations must be equally independent of the world—they should depend, not upon a Parish, though there may be one organized for secular purposes, but on the Diocesan authorities. The Missionary is not elected, but appointed. He is not paid by, or responsible to, those to whom he is sent, but those who send him. This we count to be the general statement of the Church's position as Christ's Missionary body, sent to convert the world.

Taking this broad view of our responsibilities as a Church, we see that our Missionaries are, in relation to the world, what their name indicates, "sent" men—not called, or hired, or employed, by those to whom they minister as Missionaries ; but "sent" by the Church, through its constitutional authorities ; and ministering, therefore, under a commission derived from it, for the due fulfillment of which they are to it responsible. Such is in theory our Missionary attitude ; to such a theory should our practice conform. We dismiss from consideration all Societies, whether for the West or the East, and we look to the Church's taking practically this position ; One Church, working in Unity, in one way,—by that instrumentality which is, of its essence, for the conversion of the world to Christ. We are not to gather men into Christ's Fold by flattering their vanity, or yielding to their prejudices, or lowering to their mark, or truckling to their trade ; we are to convert them to the Faith ; and, until thus converted, they are better, and the Church is better, while they are without and not within. Therefore it is we urge a reform in our policy of appropriating a small portion of the salary of the Missionary from our funds, leaving him mainly dependent on the people to whom he is sent for the rest. Better, far better, as many a Missionary will testify, that our Missionary force be reduced and our means concentrated, than that so many failures and so much expenditure be incurred, before self-supporting Parishes are built up in our Domestic field. But we believe the system which we advocate will result in no reduction of our forces, and will, at the same time, ensure success, where hitherto there has been partial or total failure. Our Committee in New York, good men and true, may yet not fully appreciate the genius

and spirit of the Western and Southern people on our vast frontiers. There are failures in our system. The Church is closed, the Services suspended, the world exults over the failure, the awakened stray off to other denominations, the congregation scatters, and the good that has been done is lost; and all because the Church has not been able to water that which she has planted. This, then, is our first proposition. Let us have men "sent" to their posts, and means sent with them, to enable them to stay there, until the self-supporting Parish is built up like an impregnable garrison, able to hold and defend itself without the subsidies of the Church at large, and becoming by contributions an increaser of the power and not a consumer.

The two things necessary, therefore, are the men and the means. And the one is as necessary as the other. To send the men is the part of the Ministry,—*the Bishops*; to furnish the means, the part of *the Laity*. No man can be "sent" as a Missionary with full powers till he be ordained, and the limitation of Ordination to the Bishops, in the Divine institution of the Church, points out that chief Officer as the fountain of authority in sending men to work in the Vineyard. By the original commission of CHRIST, the Bishop, therefore, is the head of the Missionary field in his Diocese; and there can rightly be no field of usefulness for a Missionary which is not under Episcopal government. It is his part, aided it may be by his constitutional advisers, the Standing Committee, to appoint the men and to distribute the means. We believe the true working of the Church, in its Missionary Stations, vitally depends on this power of the Bishop remaining inviolate. The self-supporting Parish has its sphere of action; and in that sphere the first of its rights is the right to call such a man, approved by Episcopal Ordination, as it may have confidence in, to preach the truth "it has received." That power of calling, dependent on the pledged support, is the recognition of the interest which the baptized communicants have in the preservation of the Faith; as the necessity of Ordination is the safeguard and seal of the authority of the ministry for the preservation of "that which they have preached." But when the Parochial authorities have exercised their right in their own sphere, it is not theirs to enter, where no such Parish organization exists, any more than to usurp authority in another Parish. Nor does their contribution of means for this outward object afford any argument for such invasion. Consistency requires that confidence be reposed in that government to which the Church has committed this care. It belongs to each self-supporting Parish to take care of its own territory;

and where self-supporting Parishes are wanting, there the jurisdiction belongs to the Bishops, and there is, therefore, no authority to send or call, but his, whose authority extends over all his Diocese. The man must be "sent;" the sending power is the Bishop, to whose care those souls are committed, that they perish not. And surely, if the vows and responsibilities of his solemn Consecration are not sufficient safeguards for the performance of his duty, under the government of the supreme Council of the Church, the irresponsible, unpledged, unconsecrated, private individual, furnishes a far less guarantee that he will take care, in assuming control over any part of the Missionary field, that there be preached the Gospel, the whole Gospel, and nothing but the Gospel.

This, then, is our System. The Clergyman is the head of the Parish or Missionary Station; the Bishop, the head of the Diocese and Clergymen; and the National Church, the head of the Bishop, and, to a certain extent, of the Diocese. The first authority is represented to us by the fact, that no Parish can make a Clergyman, but only elect and receive one. The second is represented by the passing of every head under the hand of a Bishop. And the third, the controlling power over the Bishop, by the *Conciliar* consecration required by the Canons. In no other way, than by this subordination of authority, can the unity of the Church be retained. If the Parish were not dependent on the Diocese for the Ordination of its Minister, or if the Diocese were independent of the Church in obtaining a Bishop, the Church could exercise no control in guarding from heresy, or putting down wrong principles. It is not, "we will support this man as a preacher, or lecturer, or man of talent;" but "we will support this man as an Ordained Minister." When the self-supporting Parish, therefore, furnishes within its own borders the means for carrying on Missionary operations within its own borders, it is the joint part of the Bishop and the Parish, the Rector being "received" as a Pastor, to "send" him as a Missionary. Where it is the "Station," to which this Missionary is to be sent, the responsibility falls wholly upon the Bishop, as possessing the only lawful jurisdiction. And it is therefore his business to send or appoint, as our Bishops do, under the Constitution of the Domestic Board, the men who shall labor there. And since the National Church is the head of the Bishop, it devolves upon it, in its Conciliar action, to appoint Missionary Bishops; for as the Bishop sends Priests, the Church in Council sends Bishops, and none but Bishops, since there is no other Conciliar consecration, and there is no part of the Missionary field where the Church, as such, can carry on

operations, which is not under the charge of a Bishop. There cannot rightly be any such place; for there can be no self-supporting Parish, not under a Bishop, and yet in communion with the Church, no Presbyter who can emancipate himself from the control of all Bishops by rightly going where none has jurisdiction, no Missionary Station rightly receiving aid from the Church, but by the accredited and fully competent authority of him who has been by consecration put in charge of that field. This is an essential principle, entering into the very nature of our whole Church System. If the Laity, because they have *means*, have the right to send *men* where they choose, and such men as they choose, how can the Bishops fulfill their vows according to their conscience, to drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine? If Voluntary Societies are to be a "power behind the throne," the case is in no way different. The authority is taken away from him who is made responsible for that authority by his Ordination vows, and is given to those who, by their voluntary association, are utterly irresponsible. On all sound principles, the means can be rightly furnished only in coöperation with that power which has the authority to commission *men*; and therefore, the way to dispense the means is by that recognition of the authority of those who have our Lord's Commission to watch over His heritage, which the Domestic Committee affords to the Bishops in dispensing the means flowing in upon them according to his nomination, or, what would be still better, by his sole appointment.

The question, then, whence are to come the men who labor in the Missionary field, is thus answered. They must be employed by the Church, sent by the Church, paid by the Church. First, the Church, in her Conciliar action, and by her Conciliar consecration, is pointed out as the authority to furnish Bishops only for every part of the Missionary field. We say Bishops only; because the fact of Ordination puts the mission of the Priest into the hands of some one Bishop, having jurisdiction: and the way, therefore, for the Church to take any territory under its jurisdiction, is to send there a Bishop over whom the Church has authority, and by whom she governs the field. Secondly, the Bishop sends Priests—over the self-supporting congregation, in the Pastoral relation, by the coördinate power held in connection with the elective liberty on the part of the congregation. And, thirdly, the Bishop alone sends Ministers to those Stations where (they not being in a Parish, but comprehended in the Diocese) there is no coördinate body of baptized and communicating Laity; and he is the only one who has jurisdiction.

The next thing to be considered, therefore, is the means and its attainment. And the first principle to be borne in mind is, that in complete systems the happy result depends on all parts working harmoniously. Because the Laity hold the purse, they must not despise the authority of those who hold the keys. And they who hold the keys cannot carry on their operations without the coöperation of those who hold the purse. The authority, therefore, that furnishes the men being preserved, it is clearly the duty of those who furnish the means to support these men according to their ability. In primitive days, "they laid the money at the Apostles' feet;" strange that now our modern piety should strive to cast them off altogether.

Nor need objection be taken by our jealous republicanism, looking at every such proposition as containing the seeds of despotism. For our Diocesan, as well as our Parochial ministrations, are guarded by the most insurmountable forces of republican supervision. Missionary Bishops are elected by the representatives of the whole Church in General Convention. They are the choice of the people, most solemnly designated; they are the approved of the Ministry, most solemnly ordained. Diocesan Bishops have the same relation to their Diocese that the Pastors of our Parochial congregations have to their flocks. They are elected, as worthy of the confidence of the people, to administer those very functions, and they bear, in addition, the commendation of the whole Church with which they are in communion, testified by their consecration. To such, the apportionment of the means, (with the advice of the Standing Committee,) by the designation of the men who should receive them, is due, as the administrative heads of the Church—if upon no higher principle, still upon that small measure of courtesy that is extended not merely to Bishops, but to the criminal at the bar, since he is presumed still to inherit the confidence once reposed in him, until proved unworthy of it. Granted that A, B, and C, may have an itching to get hold of Stations in his Diocese, under the pretext that the Bishop holds principles contrary to the true doctrine of the Church. The Church does not accredit those suspicions, or it would suspend him. If Churchmen give for the sake of Missionary operations, they give not to the individual, but to the Church. And if the Church be anything more than a mere sect, if she is really large enough, and broad enough, to hold in her bosom different shades of opinion, she is liberal enough also to furnish men with means, from a common source, to carry on, to the best of their understanding, conscience, and ability, the work

of any Office to which they may be called, with her approbation, doubly testified by election and Ordination.

This is then our policy with regard to the men sent into the field, and it is one in harmony with which we would see all our Domestic Missionary operations conducted. We do desire to see a total reconstruction of the system on which our means are dispensed. That system is, to aid a certain number of Missionaries from the Domestic, a few others from the Diocesan Committee, with a stated sum, divided *pro rata* out of the amount raised in, or appropriated to, the Diocese. The result is, all are more or less dependent on the world, and responsible to divided, not to say diverse, authorities. We urge that Domestic and Diocesan Missionary Funds, together with the means derived from each Station, as far as the people there appreciate the blessings of the Gospel, should be auxiliary the one to the other, and should come to the Missionary at one time, through one channel, imposing but one responsibility. In this view, the means furnished by the Church come in two ways; either wholly from within the district, in the case of the self-supporting Parish, or, in the case of the Missionary Station, wholly from without the district. We say, wholly from without, because, while it is imperatively necessary that the Station from the first be educated to contribute, it will be better that that contribution be received not by the Missionary, but by the Diocesan authority. We say, Diocesan authority, for while we claim as the principle of our Communion the fact of our Unity, we contend also that it infers no complete centralization. By the nature of our outward visible existence as a Church, we must have as many centres of aid, hearts for the circulation and distribution of the means, as we have of procuring and authorizing men. Physiologists tell us, that in the human body the digestive system is for the sake of the blood, and the venous and arterial system for the sake of the muscular, and the muscular for the sake of the nervous, and the nervous for the sake of the mind. So the system of means in the Church must be subordinate to the system of men, framed on the same analogy, and meeting at the proper points of contact. A central Committee, exercising administrative control over the heads of Bishops, in their own Missionary fields, is contrary to the genius of the Church. It is in reality a Missionary Pope. By administrative control, we mean, *that communication with the Priest, Parish, or Station, which in any case sets the Bishop aside while he remains a Bishop in good standing.* As, for instance, if the Canons require a Church to be visited, and the Bishop neglect to perform the duty, no other Bishop,—not the General Convention itself, if we understand the genius of the Church's Constitu-

tion aright,—can enter that Diocese and visit that Church. It must govern *through* the Bishop, or it must, by deposition or suspension, sever his connection with the Diocese, and make it as if there were no Bishop there, and then appoint a Bishop who will obey the Canons. The analogy holds, and more than holds, with the Central Committee, whose business it is to mediate between those parts of the Church which abound, and those which lack. It is but an accountant, a heart whose functions are mechanical entirely; it has to do with the reception of means, and their disbursements to those whom the proper authorities of the Church designate as the recipients. Hence the Central Committee has for its business to gather as much means as possible from the Church, and to distribute it honestly and faithfully, rendering an account of every penny contributed. It is a treasurer of the Missionary Fund, and nothing more. High, or Low, or Broad, it has no right to work its machinery in any other way than according to the needs of the Diocese or Missionary jurisdiction to which it may have money to apportion, no matter who may be the Bishop. If Bishop McIlvaine, or Bishop Kemper, be worthy of the confidence of the Church, he is worthy of the confidence of that Committee, or of any other, which presumes to act for the whole Church. As the Episcopal Council deals with Bishops exclusively, and consecrates only Bishops, the Central Committee should deal with Dioceses only, irrespective of opinions, and should consider only whether the authorities hold their official position under the Canons and with the approbation of the Church. It is their business only to calculate what the relative needs of Ohio and Wisconsin are, and how much money they have, or can procure to appropriate to them. And this, unless we are mistaken, is exactly the policy of the Committee, and the method upon which they have acted heretofore. Their action upon that principle is not in the least vitiated, because they retain the disbursement of the funds to the individual Missionary in their own hands, instead of paying it over to the Treasurer of the Diocesan Missions, and because they require reports from the Missionary once in six months. They have a right to know that the Missionary gets the money, and they are but fulfilling the part of faithful accountants. It is their duty to receive from the abounding, and disburse to the needy Dioceses, the means held by the Church in common, and when this is done, their action is complete. To do this, *one* central, one Domestic Missionary Committee is necessary; without *it*, or *with more than one*, the Church, *as the Church*, cannot do her work in being a Missionary to the world.

And here, in passing, we may reply to Mr. Wharton's Pamphlet, that no argument drawn from our Mother Church of England, in favor of diverse Missionary operations and more than one agency, will hold good on this side of the water, from the fact, that such "Voluntary" Societies are the attempts of individuals to remedy the false position of the English Church, in not being precisely what we are. The English Church is both a State Church, and a National Church. Hitherto it has supposed it could do nothing which is not ruled by the State, and, as a Church, it has no care of any part of the Vineyard of the world outside of the realm of England. As a Church therefore, it has ignored completely its Missionary duty; and, therefore, when more than a century and a half ago, some of its members woke up to a sense of their responsibility, they could exert themselves in no way but by "voluntary" association. Bishop Selwyn, Bishop Gray, and other of her Colonial Bishops, with their several Synods, are now taking nobler and more Scriptural ground, and with at least the connivance of the Authorities at home. But, in our own American Church, all these disabilities have been unknown from the very first. As for arguments from the policy of Rome, we may well leave them to our disagreeing friends, one of whom in by-gone days was John Henry Newman; merely remarking, that the policy of Rome for a long time before and after the Council of Trent, was to break down the Bishops by monk-Clergy responsible to their Abbots, by begging Friars responsible to their Generals, by Jesuits, and by any and every expedient that should make the Papacy what Sectism, in all its forms, would like its Institutions to be, a power behind the Bishops, ruling, fettering, and overriding them.

But to return. The Domestic Committee is a medium of communication between Diocese and Diocese, and so between the Church and her Missionary fields. It meddles not with Station and Parish, except in little technical matters. The communication of receiving and giving, is indeed immediate; but the real business is transacted, as it should be, between the Committee and the Bishops. The Bishop, therefore, in as far as he must seek for assistance from without his Diocese, turns to the Domestic Committee. But he also wants the various parts of the Diocese to help each other. He must therefore have a Diocesan Missionary Committee, as (to carry out the figure) the *heart* of the Diocese, the center of reception and supply. In this way we secure that systematic working of charity which takes care both of the home and the foreign field; which begins at home, but does not stay at home. The Parish takes care of itself; it has its system of circulation within itself, feeding its own

territory; and it goes without itself to the Diocesan and Domestic Committees. So that we may say the Parish is fed by the members of the Church, and the Diocesan Committee by the Parish, and the General Board is fed by the Diocese, and thus the money gets to every centre, and is distributed again where it is needed, from the Central Committee to the Diocese, where it receives the accession of the Diocesan Fund, and the consolidated amount is thence distributed to the Missionaries laboring at their posts.

The Domestic Committee, therefore, is rightly the *auxiliary* of the Diocesan; or, if we choose to call the Diocesan the auxiliary of the Domestic, it will not much matter. The idea is, that the resources of the Diocese, derived from both, by apportionment and collection, form one common fund, to be employed by the Diocesan authorities, according to their wisdom, for the good of the Church under their charge. The question arises, How should this money be used? The Board of Missions and many others in the Church are calling for its concentration upon "*strong points*," and the better support of Missionaries therein, even though the weaker, but still needy points, have to go unsupplied. The Bishops, on the other hand, continually pressed with calls for Missionaries, and feeling the wants of every part of the Diocese, are tempted to spread their resources as widely as possible, by cutting up the aid into the smallest slices, and leaving the Missionary Stations—pledges which the few Church people evade by the plea of inability, or too often try to make up by dishonorable as well as honorable expedients. The result of this course is at last confessed discouragement and disheartenment, our Missionaries are worn down; our people in bad repute; the "imperial attitude" of the Church and her high pretensions, a matter of ridicule; or else the Church is fettered by the fashionable, the indifferent, and the worldly. We know personally of a case where a Bishop was applied to, by a clergyman in Priest's Orders and good standing, who desired to know whether there was work for him in the Diocese. The answer he received contained the following: "The parish at ——— is vacant; they pledge \$200, to which I can add \$150 (! ! !) from the Missionary Society, \$350 in all." !! Another clergyman we could name was a Missionary in a Parish which had received aid for many years; in the winter a "Donation Party" was given him, at which people from outside attended, and gave, under the idea that it would benefit the Clergyman; but the whole amount, even to a *pair of shoe-strings*, was valued and charged upon his salary! Al-

most every Missionary feels that the only amount upon which he can rely with any certainty is the remittance from the Missionary Board; and we venture to say, there is not one in the field who would not relinquish his present nominal salary, for two-thirds the amount in regular payments from the Committee, on which he could depend. We therefore say, Let the Church do what her first Missionary principle supposes she does, pay her men altogether, and then send them to the places where their labors would be of most value. Let her consider her means as intended for the *support* of Missionaries, and not as mere aid to places. Let the place know that the Church will keep the man there, until she finds out whether the land is fruitful or unfruitful. And let it be a well-understood thing, on all hands, that when once a place is given up for its unprofitableness, labor there will not be resumed until every part of the kingdom has received or rejected the Mission. Such a high-toned principle will find a response in the hearts of the people.

Our proposition, therefore, is, that hereafter such a mode of proceeding be inaugurated in our Dioceses as shall truly carry out these principles. They are true, and they are practicable. Let the Churches throughout the country make it a matter of conscience to contribute regularly to the Domestic Committee as the representative of the whole Church. Let that Committee distribute its means fairly to Dioceses, as Dioceses recognizing the right of each to govern itself, whether by High Churchmen or Low Churchmen. If Bishops, or Missionaries, are heretics, degrade them. If they are true to Christ and the Church, sustain them. Let the Committee regard only the needs of the Missionary field, and the money at command. Let each Diocese and every congregation give its stated collections to the Diocesan Fund, or to the Domestic Committee; and then, let the Bishop alone, or the Bishop and the Standing Committee, as the Missionary Board of the Diocese, appoint the Missionaries, making their choice from the best men at their command, paying them their full salaries, sending them first to the "strongest points," keeping them there until the Church is built up on her true principles, and filling out the appropriations of the Domestic Committee with their own funds. We believe, then, the question will be practically answered, with which we set out: How to obtain the greatest amount of power with the least expenditure of means? For the men and the means will then be working under the organic law of the Church, the law of her nature, and so, the law most effective to secure the end of her being, the salvation of the world.

ART. IV.—WINSLOW'S MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

Elements of Moral Philosophy, Analytical, Synthetical, and Practical. By HUBBARD WINSLOW, D. D., Author of Intellectual Philosophy. Third Edition. New York: D. Appleton & Company. London: 16 Little Britain. 1859. 12mo. pp. 480.

IN the present Article, we can scarcely do more than to notice this excellent work upon a most important subject. We should be glad of time and room to discuss some of the more important and comprehensive questions which *any* work on Moral Philosophy should presuppose—the discussion of which, however, could hardly be included in a book designed for the purpose which Dr. Winslow seems to have had in view when he wrote.

While coinciding with our author in the main, we have some fault to find in the outset with his analysis and classification of the motive powers and influences which act in determining man's conduct. Still, however, his analysis is an improvement, in its approach towards the utmost of simplicity and completeness, upon any that we have before seen. These faults, however, do not exert any very serious influence on the general tenor of the book, or materially impair its usefulness; they scarce do more than make it somewhat less clear, less precise, and less concise, though in all these respects it is a great improvement on any of the preceding works that we have seen.

But it has great excellencies in a scientific point of view, to some of which we wish to call attention, as follows:

1. In the Analysis of Conscience, Dr. Winslow treats it as a complex and combination of the functions of the Intelligence (Insight) and the Sensibility, inasmuch as the word, as it is ordinarily used, denotes both the insight and knowledge of what is right, and the feeling of obligation to perform it. Dr. Winslow does not regard the Conscience, considered merely as intelligence or knowledge of right, as being any special faculty or function. He considers it rather as merely a variety of the general function of insight or reason; the same faculty that sees that two and two are four, or that the sum of the

parts is equal to the whole which they constitute, is precisely the same, though acting on other matters, as that which sees, decides and judges, that to speak the truth, to act benevolently, and in good faith, &c., are right, absolutely so; that is, right for all persons, at all times, in all places, if they speak or act at all.

Consistently with this, Dr. Winslow teaches that the ethic emotions follow, depend upon, and are determined by this preceding insight or judgment, so that if we see or judge an act to be right, we feel it to be obligatory; if we see or judge it to be wrong, we feel that it ought to be avoided. But our judgment may be wrong; we may judge an act to be right when it is wrong, as Saul did, when he thought he ought to persecute the Christians. But we may change our opinion of the act; and in that case our feeling towards it will change accordingly, so that what beforehand we felt that we ought to do, *because* we judged it to be right, we may come to regret exceedingly after it shall have been done, *because* we have now changed our mind on fuller knowledge of the subject, and have judged it to be wrong.

2. Dr. Winslow teaches that the primary elements of Moral-ity alone, embracing only its more comprehensive principles, are thus matter of insight, and, in their very nature, axiomatic. In these general axioms all agree; to them all minds assent; and from these *axioms*, about which there is no doubt, which no man denies or can deny, and from the *definitions* of acts, in regard to which all the doubts and differences in the moral judgments of men that exist at all, are to be found, we must build up our Moral Science. The analogy between it and Mathematics is close and striking. In Geometry, for example, all the student has to do is to find what is the application of his self-evident axioms to the figures and objects given by their definitions, with which his science treats. His axiom says that the sum of the parts is equal to the whole, and therefore, *when he ascertains the fact* that several angles make up the whole of a right angle, or a circle, he knows that they are equal to that right angle, circle, &c., as the case may be. So all men know and judge intuitively, that to speak the truth, if one speaks at all, is right, and when he has ascertained that a certain act comes within this category—truth, or under this rule, he *knows* that this act is right, and instantly and instinctively *feels* that it ought to be done.

Now the great business of Moral Philosophy is to discuss and ascertain the character of groups and classes of acts; acts which are grouped and classed together by their essential and

formal characteristics, and to show whether, by their fundamental and essential character, they come under these axioms or not. For example, Dr. Winslow, and very properly, makes a broad distinction between acts that are acts of self-love, and those that are acts of selfishness; and the moment he has pointed out the essential difference between the two classes of acts, it becomes instantly obvious, that self-love, a proper regard for one's own true welfare and happiness, is right, and even obligatory, while selfishness, which consists in, or at least always involves, the sacrifice of the rights and welfare of others for some mere transient gratification of ourselves, is always and invariably, (always and invariably, because from the nature of the case,) necessarily, wrong.

Morality regards man, not merely as he is, but as he is related to other persons and things; not individually and alone, but as in action. His duties depend upon his relations, and an act, or a class of acts, are seen to be right or wrong, just as they are seen to be conducive or otherwise to the order and welfare of this whole, of which he is a living and acting part; and veracity, benevolence, fidelity, &c., are seen to be, to the moral world, what gravity, &c., are in the natural world. Bodies gravitate in proportion to their quantity of matter, and inversely as the square of their distance; because so, and so only, can harmony and order be preserved amongst them without an arbitrary interposition of *personal* force on the part of the Creator and Governor of the world; and, with such an interposition, it would not be a universe or Cosmos at all, in any proper sense of those words. Precisely so, veracity, as a law of intercommunication with one another, is the only law and condition on which there can be any *society* among intelligent beings who are moral agents. Hence the moralist should investigate the sphere of veracity, see what acts it includes, and why; and, precisely so far as it does this, it will determine for us what is our duty, to the extent at least to which our duty depends upon absolute and immutable principles, rather than upon positive enactments and the commands of God.

3. To one more point, as essential and fundamental in any system of Moral Philosophy, will we call attention; namely, the broad distinction between the moral quality of an act, and the guilt or innocence of the agent. The character of an act is determined by its nature, which is but another name for its relations and tendencies, &c., as just specified, and is wholly independent of the motives and intentions of the agent, while these motives, intentions, &c., are an essential element in constituting the guilt or innocence of the agent. One may cer-

tainly do a right and proper act from a wrong motive; and *vice versa*, one may do an act that is wrong and ought not to be done at all, from the very best of motives. St. Paul, when as Saul he persecuted the Church, thinking that by that very act he was doing God service, is an example of the latter kind; and those persons of whom the same Apostle speaks (Phil. i, 16) when he says that they preached Christ of envy and strife, thinking to add affliction to his bonds, clearly afford an example of the other kind. No one will doubt that the act of preaching Christ was a good one, an act that ought to have been performed. But we may certainly doubt whether the performance of it, *from such motives*, envy and strife, could either improve the moral status of the agent, or secure for him the approbation and favor of God.

Hence it is evident, that a person may be innocent while doing wrong, that is, justifiable even in the performance of unjust acts, and guilty when doing right; the character of the act being one thing, and the character of the agent being another; and although they will always, to a considerable extent, coincide, so that he who *does* right will be righteous, and he who *does* wrong will be guilty, yet the connection is not a necessary one; nor do we believe it to be so constant as is generally supposed. We believe, on the other hand, that there is far more of good intention in the world than the amount of wrong doing actually committed would indicate, and also that there is a vast amount of what is right and proper in itself done from motives of self-interest, and even of malignity, to such an extent as to vitiate the moral character of the agent in that act, and cause him to be consigned to the perdition of the ungodly. Our Lord assures us, that in the day of judgment many will appear before Him, claiming to have done many good and even wonderful works in His name, whom, however, he will reject; not, as we are led to believe, because they had not done the works, but because they had not done them *in His Spirit*, or with the right motive. It is the dignity of man, the crowning glory of humanity, that it can, *unlike the brutes*, rise above the mere instinctive impulses of his nature and natural constitution, choose, from his knowledge of them, and in view of their real character, the objects he will pursue, select his means in reference to the object he has chosen, and direct his energies of body and soul towards the accomplishment of that object, and thus live above the world, while he lives in it, a rational life while living in the body. But to do this there must be a constant exercise of the reason, that we may *know* what ought to be done, what is right in itself, and its relations to the grand

totality of the universal Cosmos, and a constant watchfulness of self to see that *our motives are right*, and that we are pursuing this high, holy, and impersonal object from high and holy motives, instead of making the mere projections of our low, narrow, and perhaps selfish ends the objects for which we live and act, from no other motives than the mere constitutional force of the animal sensibility.

It is, however, very seldom that any one act, when regarded as a means to any given end, can be judged of or decided upon by any single observation, or from a single point of view. Every act, or at least nearly every one, has natural consequences of its own over and above any with which we may choose to connect it, *as a means*, in our small providence of affairs, which consequences are often of so much importance as to compel us to reject, as in no case allowable, the very thing, which, so far as we can see, is the most direct and efficient as a means to the end we have in view. Such is of course the case with all acts that come within the categories of fraud, malignity, profanity, &c. No such acts may be performed for any end. It is common to speak of them as wrong *in themselves*, or *absolutely* wrong. But such expressions are absurd. An act in itself, aside from its influences and relations in general, has no *moral* character. Hence its character is always relative. But the expressions, "right in themselves," and "absolutely right," denote a class which needs some discriminating epithet. The acts commonly designated by those qualities, are those that are always right; acts that can be brought into no colligation or combination, when they *may* be left undone, or their contraries done in their stead; acts of such a character that either themselves or nothing must be done; as, for example, to speak the truth if one speaks at all. To speak at all, may be wrong in some cases; but the fault of the act, if we speak at all, does never arise from the truthfulness of what is said.

Hence, in all cases, each act must first be considered in its most general character, and, if found to be right or wrong in that view, it must be so held and regarded, irrespective of its relation to any subordinate end we may have in view, and in relation to which we may be disposed to regard it merely as a means. One who is guided in his choice of acts by this more general view, is a man of high moral character. One who neglects it, and considers all acts only as means to his ends, is a man of narrow views, and of a low moral character, subordinating, so far as he can, not only truth and justice and right to his own personal ends, but also the interests, happiness, and

welfare of other intelligent beings, and even the Providence and attributes of God Himself, so far as he can, to the pigmy almightiness of the worthless worm whose vision takes in nothing that can make him forget self in a generous devotion to something higher.

This brings us to a point in which we shall differ from Dr. Winslow. In what does the righteousness of the agent consist? In the choice, or in the constitutional tendencies, which are anterior to choice, and constitute its emotional antecedent? Or in both? That choice is a moral act, no one can doubt. But does its morality, its guilt or innocence, and so the responsibility of the agent, begin with choice? This, we believe, is Dr. Winslow's theory. It is, as our readers will understand, the New School or Taylor theory, as opposed to the Old School or Tyler theory, among the Presbyterians. We take it to be beyond all question, that "Sin," in the Scripture sense of the word, is an attribute of man's nature, in his present fallen condition, as well as a quality that may be affirmed of his acts. If any one doubts that man's proclivity to transgression is called Sin by the sacred writers, let him consult Rom. v. and vii. chapters. Referring to transgression, St. Paul says: "Now then, it is no more I that do it, but Sin that dwelleth in me." St. Paul has been guilty of no such solecism as to make the mere quality of an act, or a series of them, to be the agent and cause (occasional or efficient) of their performance. Nor do we think that there can be any better ground for doubting that this "Sin," which is thus an attribute of our fallen nature, is the ground of a condemnation and natural exclusion from the favor of God; so that man is condemned for his nature, and "by nature a child of wrath."

Now if we are right in this, theologically sin and guilt do not depend upon or reside in the will and choice alone, but in the nature, the feelings, the constitutional emotions, appetites, affections, and desires of man, as well. And we are certainly inclined to take this view, also ethically and on philosophical grounds. Whatever in man tends to evil is wrong. It makes a part of man's character. It is one of the qualities or properties by which we judge of him here, and by which he will be judged at last. If man is so constituted, that the emotions excited in him by the objects around him, that is, so constituted that his natural appetites, affections, or desires would lead him wrong, there must be something wrong in him. The influence of surrounding objects, their attractions and repulsions, &c., keep all else but man in the right way. Whether we regard the inanimate masses of matter, of which the earth

is composed, or the animals that are guided by mere instinct, we find them obeying the laws of their being. And we infer, that if such objects exert an influence in any different direction upon man, the fault must be in himself, and not in them. To say that he is endowed with reason and will, so that he can counteract these tendencies to wrong, does not in the least change *their* character, though it does undoubtedly greatly change *his* position and responsibilities. That there is some such discrepancy in man that his appetites, desires, &c., excited by objects around him, would often lead him to sin *without* the restraints of reason, and do sometimes so lead him even *with* those restraints, admits of no doubt. This discord, as we believe, confirms the doctrine of the Fall, and shows man to be in an abnormal, depraved condition.

Still, however, this is rather a question affecting the theoretical accuracy of Dr. Winslow's book, than the soundness of its practical teachings. There are, besides, a few topics that are necessary to a thorough and complete treatise of Moral Science, which are wholly omitted, or but slightly discussed in the book before us. Of these, perhaps the most important, and certainly the most difficult, is that which pertains to the limitation of man's responsibility. It is easy enough to show, that benevolence is a duty, and that the specified form of benevolence which gives away a portion of one's income or possessions to the relief of the destitute or necessitous, is a duty. But where does this duty end? What are the limits of our obligations in that direction? A limit there must be, or no man can be innocent with so much as a dollar in his pocket, since there never is a time when there is not some suffering, in body or soul, or both, from hunger, ignorance, &c., which his dollar would help to relieve. And if we hold that compassion is absolute, that the obligation to give can cease only when the last penny is gone, or there is no longer sufferer or suffering to be relieved, the right of private ownership is at once at an end.

But we have already exceeded the limits which we at first set to our Article, and we close by saying, that although Dr. Winslow's book is not quite so exhaustive of its subject, nor quite so thoroughly condensed, as we could wish to see a book on that subject, and although these peculiarities will operate to some extent as an obstacle to their finding their way into our higher Colleges as text-books to be used there, it is probably all the better calculated for that much wider sphere, for which it was more especially designed, general reading, and the unnumbered scores of Schools and Academies throughout our land. And to all such institutions we heartily commend

it, as being, in our estimation, the most sound, the most salutary in its influence, and the most satisfactory in its account of man's nature and duties, of any which the Press has yet given to the public. There is everywhere manifest a purity of heart, an earnestness of purpose, a love of truth, which work upon the heart of the student, and render a most salutary moral impression in favor of virtue, at the same time as this course of thought leads him to see most clearly, not only what is the right way, but also why it is so. This moral influence of the work we regard as a matter of special importance. And in this respect, as well as the many others we have specified, we regard Dr. Winslow's as far surpassing all others.

ART. V.—GOD'S SOVEREIGNTY IN THE GOSPEL.

1. *Presbyterian Confession of Faith*, Chap. III.
2. *Cambridge and Saybrook Confessions of Faith*, Chap. III.
3. *Baptist Confession of Faith*, Chap. III. London: 1688.

THE subject which we introduce to the attention of our readers is one which formerly was of great and absorbing interest with several of the prominent sects in the theological world; but which, partly by the ascendancy of new points of controversy, and partly through a prudent sensibility to the mischievous tendencies of the prevailing mode of treatment, seems now to be put in the shade. The subject is that of the SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD. Only a few years ago this was the great burden of discussion in a large proportion of the discourses delivered by divines, learned and unlearned, among three at least of the larger sects—the Congregational, the Presbyterian, and the Baptist. And such was the usual style of discussion, and such were the principles maintained, that people of plain, unpledged, and unprejudiced minds were not able to see how the common doctrine differed from that of downright fatalism. Hence arose distraction in religious societies, and hence a subdivision of sects.

Latterly, without any acknowledged change in the old dogmatic Confessions of Faith, known as those of Westminster, Cambridge, and Saybrook, there has been a more guarded style of preaching and teaching; a style less adventurous, less blunt, and less paradoxical. Still, the old Calvinistic System, we apprehend, is in no sense abandoned or finally disposed of. And in the course of revolving cycles the old controversy may at short notice come up again, and run as vigorous a course as ever.

In the mean time, it becomes the duty of the friends of sound, scriptural truth, to persevere in those studies, and to exercise themselves in those illustrations of doctrine, by which the ways of God to man may be clearly vindicated, and by which, in the minds of His sinful creatures, the conviction of the righteousness of both His exactions and His inflictions may be made strong and deep. Using this "faithful dili-

gence," they will be prepared to withstand the effects of error, whenever and however error may reappear.

Under impressions quickened by these considerations, and not unmindful of the fact, that we have never in the course of our labors brought the subject under formal discussion, we call the attention of our readers to the SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD, received as a principle to be acknowledged and proclaimed in connection with and in relation to the eternal salvation of men.

We may be allowed to remark, that, in general, to exhibit divine truth as a naked abstraction, like a theorem in Geometry, or to attempt the diffusion of knowledge by the simple statement of first principles, is not the best method for imparting instruction, or for giving aid in the acquisition of new ideas on difficult subjects. Truth is essentially a spirit—a subtle spirit—but is not effectively and fruitfully known in the mere thought and conception of speculative minds. Her exceeding excellence in certainty, purity, beauty, and loveliness, is more clearly and intelligently apprehended, when clothed in the facts of Divine dispensations, and exhibited in forms cognizable by human observation and experience. In conformity with this, the theologian shows what God *is*, by throwing the light of illustration on what *He does*; and what man is, by holding up to view his life and conduct. In giving the results of our studies and meditations on the subject proposed, we shall endeavor not to lose sight of this consideration.

In presenting our views of the Sovereignty of God, contemplated in its relation to the work of Redemption, we shall use language with freedom, though, we trust, with a reasonable approximation to logical precision. In the minds of the friends of Calvinistic theology our language, as well as the boldness of our thoughts, may occasion some solicitude as respects the honor and the infiniteness of the Divine character. In many persons the spirit of inquiry is paralyzed by a fear, lest, in the attribute of Sovereignty, God should not receive the honor due to His exalted Name, and lest man should assert the power of doing something, which would or could defeat the counsel of God, or render it impossible for Him to execute His own will. Some preachers and writers, if language has an established meaning, have gone so far as in effect to make Him the determiner and performer of sin—lest He should lose the honor of being a Sovereign over all beings and all actions. In what strange forms are the laws of mind sometimes developed!

In order to our gaining distinct and well defined concep-

tions, which may be identified with our faith in truth, and to prepare our minds for comprehending the character of the God of the Redemptive System, we must give our attention to an important distinction. The reader will see that it is a distinction of the very greatest moment, and that the whole controversy must turn upon it.

We must distinguish between the *Absolute* Sovereignty of God, and that modified or limited Sovereignty, under which He exhibits Himself in the Gospel. We say modified or limited, because nothing can be more evident than that the great principles of Mercy and Grace necessarily imply an arresting of the operation of *absolute* laws, and the instituting of a new way of dealing with creatures. In Himself, and considered as an Administrator of a physical kingdom, without reference to His character as a merciful Father to a fallen world, for the salvation of which He has formed a very peculiar and wonderful design, He is, in the highest sense, an Absolute Sovereign. He possesses illimitable power over all beings and all things. And that power it is right for Him to exercise according to the counsel of His own will,—or rather according to His own infinite reason—to produce or destroy, to kill or to make alive. It is perfectly impossible to conceive of anything more absolute and uncontrollable, and above all question and all accountability, than this dominion of the Great Supreme. Is it His will to create a world? The Angels look out, and there it is. Is it His will to make one a world of flaming light and heat, and to send other worlds, by an appropriate law, in ceaseless revolution around it? “He spake the word, and they were made; He commanded, and it stood fast.” “He appointed the moon for certain seasons, and the sun knoweth his going down.” Every created being and thing received originally its measure of existence and its law of action from Him. And it is a sufficient reason for any part of His work, that it was His will to have it thus, and not otherwise.

If any one calls on us to account for the existence of the present constitution of nature, we say at once, we know of no light beyond this, and can ascend no higher in knowledge. It is what it is, because He willed it. “His counsel must stand, and He will do all His pleasure.” All other wills and all other powers in the universe cannot reverse it, nor remove a single atom from the place to which he appointed it.

Such is the Sovereignty of God in nature, a Sovereignty absolute, undivided, and unlimited. He is, in the highest and simplest of possible forms of affirmation, “all in all.” And no creature can subsist a moment without conforming to the law

of this Sovereignty. There is not a finite will in the universe, that can move the minutest particle of matter, except by laws of His enacting.

The same views are to be maintained with respect to the original and essential Sovereignty of God in the Moral World. He can not only make laws, but can unfailingly cause them to be obeyed. He can, if He please, keep His system perfect and above all possibility of infraction, throughout His universe. He could (who will doubt it?) have done this before a sinner existed, if He would. So far as we can see, He could have formed a glorious system of agencies and operations, and carried it out to glorious results, with the entire and absolute exclusion of all fallibility, all errability, and all evil.

But that, He has not chosen to do. And if the reason is demanded, the only answer we can give is, that in the exercise of His Sovereignty He determined to do otherwise. The counsel was His own, and no motive could exist beyond Himself, and of course none could be assigned. Consistency and stability imperiously required, that as an absolute Giver and Administrator of law, He should develop the powers and purposes of His system with the certainty and completeness of machinery, if the illustration may be allowed, that is infinitely perfect.

Thus, in establishing the present order and system, God did not consult the will, or the wisdom, or the might of any other being. Than this, we can have no higher idea of Sovereignty. It was in the exercise of this that He made worlds, as means for displaying the glorious attributes of His character, and created angels and men as beings capable of beholding and tracing and admiring those attributes. Before this, if we may be allowed to suppose an antecedent period, God acted only and was known only as an Absolute Sovereign, Whose will nothing resisted, Whose counsel nothing opposed, Whose purposes had "free course and were glorified." What His wisdom approved, He caused to be done. He did not then, as under the present system of procedure with the race of man He does now, leave open a way by which His designs and works might be resisted and thrust out of place, and come in with an after-measure, (we trust there is nothing irreverent in our language,) by way of remedy for the disturbance and the evil thus produced. Then, all things moved onward only. The arrow sped straight to the mark. No remedies needed to be sought, no breaches to be repaired, no infractions to be avenged.

But here our line of thought must be changed, if we aspire

to understand certain wonders of Divine Dispensation, which the holy "Angels desire to look into." Is it not evident, that thus far we have not a statement, nor an explanation, nor indeed a key to an explanation, of that system of Divine Grace and administration, which works out the redemption and salvation of transgressors? When the peculiar revelations and facts of the Redemptive Work are brought under close and intelligent inspection, is it not plain, that the God of the Gospel exhibits Himself to the view of faith under the character and condition of a Sovereignty different in its action from that apparent in Nature and Providence? And is not the difference such almost, that, without irreverence and without inaptitude, we may apply to the case language well understood among men, and call it a *Limited Sovereignty*? Not that it is limited by external pressure, or by involuntary circumscription, but by illimitable Grace,—by promises graciously made to the world under the promptings of its own sublime wisdom and mercy. It is not meant, that God has divested Himself of any attribute of power, or dominion, or wisdom; but that He has been pleased to restore to the soul of sinful man the blessed Spirit's presence, and, through that, the capacity (lost in the Fall) of choosing good and rejecting evil; and thus, giving him power, by rekindling in him the principle of divine life, to become again the son of God by his own (not independent, but still truly his own) determination to return to holy obedience. In other words, God has been pleased to restore to man—to the race of man—the capacity of being a steward, a steward in the making and use of himself; but, above all, a steward of those revelations, mercies, Gifts of Grace, and holy Institutions, which, in the end, bring to the faithful "an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, eternal in the heavens." We mean that He has restored to man, not a *self-determining* power, which is an expression no more proper, perhaps, in spiritual things than that of *self-lifting* power is in physicks, but simply a *determining* power, a power to create mental decisions between good and evil, and to originate actions, for which he may be equitably held to account. Thus man is made a steward, both ministerially and personally.

God, rising, if we may so say, to a higher and more wonderful form of Sovereignty, has in mercy appointed a way for arresting that *absolute curse*, through which sin would otherwise have proved a final and inevitable ruin. He has treated man as actually standing forth in the new character, recognized

in the day of Adam's Fall, thus, "Behold the man has become as one of Us to know good and evil."

And, what perhaps is more than all, in giving interest to these views, He has graciously bound Himself by promise, not in the way of concession, but as a measure of love and mercy, not as if He were weak, and could not enforce the claims of Sovereignty, nor compel submission and obedience, but as from a Father's tenderness, Who, while He has the right and power to execute justice, has clemency also to forgive, He has, we say, graciously bound Himself by promise to give to sinful men the benefit of a new thing in the universe. Thus, He has made for them, and showed to them, a way of returning to life, and peace, and joy in God, (after condemnation and spiritual death,) which even the Angels in Heaven regarded with amazement, and of which no previous occurrence in the Divine administration had given them the least conception. For this reason precisely it was, that the Angels desired to look into those things. Even to them, there was something new, and surprising, and incomprehensible! At first, they did not see how the Kingdom of God could stand under a way of governing that admitted of His loving the rebellious. They could not understand how the great principles of holiness and sovereignty were to be maintained under such an administration.

In giving to a lost world this way of life, called in Scripture a "new and living way," God has all the justice, all the holiness, and all the power, that ever He had. And if it were agreeable to His counsel, He could crush and annihilate every sinner in His dominions in a moment.

But perhaps some will think they see difficulties in these views. We are not without apprehension of its being objected that we leave open a door by which sin might enter in revelry and overturn the government of the Almighty. Not so. He has not lost nor parted with the smallest portion of His power. If His sovereign interposition should be necessary, He can save the order, harmony, and integrity of the universe at any moment. We do not know but this is a miracle which by the blessed Angels is witnessed frequently.

Of this we may be certain; that by an act of Sovereign mercy, through the atoning work of Christ, God arrested the ruin of our whole race; or, rather, by giving back the Holy Spirit to human nature and throwing into the midst of its desolate state, privileges, and Spiritual Gifts, and Means of Grace, and new life, He presented an opportunity for the

eternal salvation of all. Not actually has He saved all, nor promised to save all; but, within the reach of all, salvation has assuredly been placed. As the Apostle saith, "He has given us power to become the sons of God." In all the Bible there is not a passage which, more admirably than this, expresses the effect of the Atonement and the primary Gifts of Grace. The Atonement was designed to justify God's Mercy in restoring man to the power of choice, and in imparting to him such gifts of present and available Grace as might enable him to escape from that hopeless condemnation which had crushed forever "the Angels that fell." And this is strongly and clearly expressed by the Apostle St. John, in the words quoted above from the first chapter of his Gospel: "To as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God."

Hence, we think we fairly and Scripturally obtain this conclusion; that when we speak of the source or ordaining of the original law of righteousness and holiness, we should refer it to His Absolute Sovereignty, as we should also when we speak of that *new thing* in the mode of God's reigning, the Mystery of the blessed Scheme of Redemption.

But we desire to be distinctly understood on this point, viz, that the personal salvation of men, their salvation as individuals, is not determined by His *Absolute Sovereignty*, but by their own will and choice, accepting and acting under the gracious power conferred in and by the Atonement. God has not determined the salvation of individuals, except as they faithfully exercise that mysterious power imparted to them, through Grace, with respect to their spiritual condition, and voluntarily conform to His gracious design, and submit to be sanctified in their souls through the Truth. Before the minds of all He has set life and death, and then, this word, which has sounded in all lands: "*This* do, and thou shalt live forever—do *that*, and thou shalt die the second death;" thus putting the power of life and the scale of destiny in their own hands.

In a sense no way conflicting with truth, or derogatory to His honor, it may be affirmed that God has made men sovereigns over their spiritual character and prospects, because He has made the question of character and prospects to depend on the originating power of their regenerated (we hope the word will not be objected to) and reëdowed personality. It is for them, individually, to decide, by aids already received or within their reach, what their future condition shall be. If life is the object of their choice,

they may have it; if they prefer death, that also they may have.

In presenting these views we have before our minds, of course, the case of that portion of the human family whose moral powers, in some degree developed, have entered into action, giving birth to consciousness, thought, desire, love, and pursuit. But now what shall be said of infants? Just this. Infants dying without actually, really sinning, that is, without "sinning after the similitude of Adam's transgression," we are graciously permitted to believe will be carried "through the Redemption that is in Christ," passively, and, may we not say, unconsciously into the Kingdom of Heaven.

But not so with real transgressors. These have an active will, which must submit to apply its working and producing power in concurrence and harmony with the Will of God. Their dominion over themselves must join itself by Faith to His dominion, and appropriate to itself "the power of His Grace." They can alter nothing. By His counsel, which will stand though all things else fail, they must live; or by His counsel they must perish forever.

Such are the views to which the Word of God and the analogy of things have conducted our minds, touching the parts borne respectively by God and man in the matter of salvation by the Gospel. Such, if our language truly expresses our understanding, are our conclusions concerning the Sovereignty of the God of the Gospel, and the power of man derived from that Sovereignty through Grace, over his final allotment.

In submitting the subject to our readers, we beg to call their attention to the practical effect of the views we have endeavored to present. If we are right in the truth, then, in what a position of responsibility are men placed! With a dominion over themselves, which they are conscious is real and actual, and at the same time a known and irreversible subjection to the dominion of God!! Not machines, which, when properly constructed and adjusted according to the laws of matter, cannot go wrong; they are *stewards*, to whom God has given such sway and power that they can act even as enemies to His Kingdom. Here is "*imperium in imperio!*" And yet all will be done and all end consistently with truth, and order, and harmony. Man may turn the natural powers which the Creator has given him, and the new life which Christ has purchased for him with His blood, to the promotion of sin and disorder; but in the end there will be glory and honor to

God, and to all who "lay hold on the hope set before them in the Gospel."

It is only by taking things in this light that we can see reason and justice in holding men to accountability. If God determines the character, and the happiness or misery of His individual creatures, as He determines the circulation of the blood, or the tides of the ocean, or the descent of water in the rivers, or the destruction of property by its accumulated and uncontrollable pressure, then we must conclude and believe that the feeling of remorse for guilt is a mistake of human ignorance and weakness. What are all the glosses, and definitions, and syllogisms of ingenious Calvinism, when weighed against the first principle of a Revelation which was and is, that God is doing a new thing among creatures, even restoring man to power, under help of Grace given, over himself and his own future? The feeling of *remorse for guilt*, when one has done the very thing, and that only, which God predestined and appointed him to do, is an ERROR. If God, by an act of Absolute Sovereignty, predestines the character and condition of every individual, (and of course providing and appropriating the means which make him what he is,) then it is simply absurd to address man as a producing personal cause, or as being capable of originating a line of conduct calling for punishment or challenging reward. In that case man cannot oppose God, because in whatever he does he is doing the will of God, which cannot be wrong.

We are much inclined to renew the old questions, which the Predestinarians could never answer but by saying, "Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" Does the Supreme Being, by an act of His Absolute Sovereignty, foreordain the final and eternal condition of the individuals of our race? Or, does He, in Sovereignty, predestinate all the thoughts, actions, feelings, and characters of His creatures? Does He cause wills to determine, and minds to think, as He causes rivers to flow, and lightnings to flash? If the answer is "Yea," then we affirm again that the consciousness of guilt is an error of nature, and the worst that can be said of sin is, that it is a misfortune. Many hardened sinners, without doubt, would be gladdened by an exhibition of plausible grounds for that answer—much, perhaps, on the principle of the compliment once paid to a preacher of Universalism: "I would give ten thousand dollars if his doctrines were true."

But it cannot be so. By the terms and promises of the Gospel based on the Atonement, and ratified and sealed in

the Ordinance of Baptism, God has constituted man the determiner of his spiritual condition and final lot, by giving him power to decide what that condition and that lot shall be. And thus to the lost sinner He can say, in perfect truth, "Thou hast *destroyed thyself*." He has pledged His word that if men will show themselves true and faithful sons, and fulfill His gracious purpose in restoring the lost principle of spiritual life, they shall receive increasing tokens of His love and favor. Let the husbandman take the offered seed and sow it, and cultivate it; the Lord of the harvest will not fail to give fertile soil, and genial showers, and quickening sunshine. All real power is from Him; but not in a sense which makes Him the thinker of our thoughts, or the doer of our actions.

We have but a few words more, which having said, we shall leave the subject to the consideration of our readers. In the views which we have presented, we discover nothing derogatory to the character of the Great Supreme. Far from denying Him the power of Governing His Kingdom in the way of His own wisdom, these views recognize a glorious vastness of resources for blessing the human race; while it is maintained that He reveals a peculiar, wonderful, and, in many respects, mysterious system under which He exalts man by constituting him a trustee and self-governor, with power to be unfaithful and do wrong, but with right and interest only to do right. The great point before our minds, which we have endeavored (perhaps not as successfully as we wished) to set in a strong light, is this: that, in consideration of the Atonement of Calvary, and in display of His own infinite Love, God has endowed—perhaps we should say *reëndowed*—human nature with a capacity for receiving and weighing a message from Him, thus giving a qualification to all men for taking the trust implied in *stewardship*, and laying a foundation for justly holding them to account. This, to our minds, is a point of unspeakable importance; a point on which Christian teachers are too sparing of their strength; a point which, if faithfully urged, would rouse the sensibilities of many hearts now sleeping in sin. Men have been told that they have been sinning against offered Grace, until they think themselves quite excusable for not being made willing to accept the offer. Let them be charged with sinning against Grace already *given* and *received* in the soul. Let them know that "the Kingdom of God is" even now "within them." In that case, it may be hoped the lethargy of many will be startled, and the cry come forth from troubled spirits, "Surely the Lord is in this place and I knew it not."

ART. VI.—BISHOP DOANE.

1. *The Great Hearted Shepherd: The Sermon in memory of the Right Reverend GEORGE WASHINGTON DOANE, D. D., LL. D., late Bishop of the Diocese of New Jersey; preached by request of the Standing Committee, during the session of the Convention of the Diocese, in St. Mary's Church, Burlington, Wednesday Evening, May 25th, 1859, by the Rev. M. MAHAN, D. D., St. Mark's-in-the-Bowery Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the General Theological Seminary.*
2. *The Sermon preached in St. Mary's Church, Burlington, on the first Sunday after Easter, 1859, the Sunday morning after the death of BISHOP DOANE, by the Rev. F. OGILBY, D. D., Assistant Minister of Trinity Church, New York.*
3. *A Funeral Sermon on the occasion of the death of BISHOP DOANE; preached in the Presbyterian Church, Burlington, N. J., on May 1st, 1859, by CORTLANDT VAN RENNELAER, D. D., a Minister of the Presbyterian Church.*

It may be said of prominent Bishops of the Church, as of great Generals or great Statesmen, posterity alone can do them full justice. The motives by which they have been actuated, the principles for which they have contended, the difficulties with which they have been surrounded, the trials they have had to suffer, and the lasting foundations which they have laid, cannot be calmly estimated by those who have struggled with them side by side. Personal feelings and prejudices cannot easily be overcome. We view everything from our own stand-point, and our approval or condemnation will be more or less colored, as we happen to have been for or against the principles which we are called upon to judge. Not that we have any doubt as to the judgment which posterity will pass upon the life and labors of the wonderfully endowed Bishop, whose name is placed at the head of this Article, for it is, in a measure, already written upon the Church; but as our plea for not attempting more now than a brief outline of the leading events of his life. His biography has yet to be carefully written. And when posterity shall have calmly weighed his remarkably varied gifts and graces, his self-consuming zeal, his sympathizing love, his singular magnanimity, and faith, and patience,

and hope amidst the darkest clouds of adversity, his extraordinary power as a preacher, his skill as a teacher, his soundness as a theologian, his talents as a poet, his far-seeing wisdom as a counselor, and his fidelity and tenderness as a Pastor and Shepherd of souls, together with his manifold labors and sufferings for Christ's sake, we doubt not but that it will place him not only by the side of Seabury, and White, and Hobart, who laid the foundations of the Church in this Western world, but enroll his name high up among the greatest and best Bishops with which God has blessed His Church on earth.

GEORGE WASHINGTON DOANE was born in Trenton, N. J., May 27th, A. D. 1799. Of humble parentage, his father a carpenter by trade, the Bishop's position in life is to be attributed, under God, entirely to his own exertions and persevering will. While yet a boy his parents removed with him to New York, where he began his education, under the care of that excellent scholar and accomplished linguist, the Rev. Dr. Barry, afterwards the Rector of St. Matthew's Church, Jersey City, N. J. Here he laid the foundation of his exact knowledge of the Ancient Languages—an accomplishment which he cherished until the end of his life—their choicest sayings, when among his Clergy, bubbling forth from his lips with an ease and rapidity which astonished his hearers. From New York he removed to Geneva, where he was prepared for College by Mr. Hubbell. "Here he showed (says Dr. Mahan) his zeal for the principles instilled into him from childhood, by declining to learn his Christian duties from any other Catechism than that of the Church. For this he was whipped and disgraced. But the firmness of the boy-martyr rallied many of his companions around him; and, in the end, those who preferred the Church Catechism were allowed to use it." During this period many of his leisure hours were spent in a printing office, near his parents' residence, and the knowledge which he there acquired of type-setting and proof-reading, was of great service to him in after years. In 1816, he entered Union College, Schenectady, the expense of his education there having been provided by a liberal Churchwoman, who has lately entered into her rest, after a life filled with good works. "About this time he seems to have formed that habit of working late at night, which doubtless took something from the length, but added more to the intensity and efficiency of his after-life. He usually studied till twelve o'clock, four of the hours thus gained, being given to extra-Collegiate reading." During his Collegiate course he was noted for his attention to his studies, and his ability as a clear and beautiful writer; his

great diffidence and modesty, which always raised a blush upon his cheek every time that he recited and prevented him from finishing a single declamation which was required of him, alone giving him the second, instead of the first, place in a class of more than ordinary ability. This bashfulness continued to annoy him until several years after his Consecration to the Episcopate. Though in a College not under the influences of the Church, Mr. Doane was always most regular in his attendance at the Services of the Church, in the village; and an aged Presbyter, who was at that time his classmate and most intimate friend, has stated to us, more than once, that he was the purest minded young man that he ever met. In 1818, immediately after his graduation, he removed to New York, and began the study of the Law; but this not according with his tastes, he turned his attention to Theology, pursuing his studies in a class under the care of Bishop Hobart, Dr. Brownell, and Dr. Jarvis, which was the nucleus of our present General Theological Seminary. His leisure hours were, at this period, devoted to teaching, for the support of his mother and sisters; and the love and filial affection of the son is still spoken of by those who were in the habit of visiting him in his simple home. In 1821, Bishop Hobart Ordained him Deacon, and Priest in 1823. He received the appointment of Assistant Minister in Trinity Church, and united with the Rev. Mr. Upfold (now the Bishop of Indiana) in organizing what is now St. Luke's Church, the first Services being held in a watch-house.

"In 1824, he was elected Professor of Belles-Lettres in Washington (now Trinity) College, Hartford, and traveled, raising funds for the College, all through the South. In this place began his deep rooted intimacy, so tender and so enduring, with that noble Christian Pastor and soldier of the Cross, the Rev. Dr. WILLIAM CROSWELL;" a love which his loving nature cherished through life. Few of our readers will have forgotten the touching Memorial of Dr. Croswell from his pen, which was printed in this Review; and after the Bishop's death there was found in a little pocket-book, which he always carried with him, a lock of Dr. Croswell's hair. While holding this Professorship, the two were associated in editing a staunch Church periodical, called the "*Episcopal Watchman*." In this paper many of the earlier poetical productions of these kindred spirits appeared.

In 1828, he removed to Boston, being chosen Assistant to Dr. Gardiner, Rector of Trinity Church. On the death of the Rector, he was elected to fill his place, the Rev. Mr. Hop-

kins (now the Bishop of Vermont) having been chosen his Assistant.* This was a post of great honor and usefulness. With a large congregation, comprising some of the first men in the country, in a community which appreciated his literary abilities, a salary ample for all his wants, and surrounded by devoted and admiring friends, it was a position which few men would not have coveted, and where he might have led a comparatively easy life, finishing his course with joy. But God had greater designs in view for him. Such a man was not to be left with any mere parochial charge. The Diocese of New Jersey became vacant by the death of its first Bishop, the Rev. Dr. Croes, in 1832. After several ballotings, Mr. Doane was elected and unanimously declared his successor on the third of October of the same year; and the readiness with which he assumed the fearful responsibilities of the Episcopate, giving up a most excellent position in the Church for the charge of what was then a weak and feeble Diocese, when convinced that it was the call of God, we regard as one of the remarkable ventures of faith in his life. The Diocese of New Jersey numbered at that time less than a score of Clergy within its limits, and its first Bishop had been compelled to eke out his scanty salary by assuming the entire pastoral charge of Christ Church, New Brunswick. And so poor indeed was the prospect of its growth supposed to be, that when the election of Mr. Doane was spoken of at a casual meeting of several leading Clergymen in Hartford, one of them did not hesitate to express his surprise that the Rector of Trinity Church, Boston, should think of taking charge of a Diocese which had been *dead and buried for twenty years*; and Bishop Croes, in his last Address to his Diocesan Convention, felt called upon to say, that they had cause to thank God that they had not *lost anything since they last assembled*. To decide the question whether he would resign a rectorship in every way to be desired, and accept the Episcopate of such a Diocese, less than a fortnight was allowed him. The first intimation that he had of his election was the appearance, October 6th, at his residence in Boston, of the Committee appointed by the Convention of New Jersey, to announce to him the fact; and the General Convention, at which it was desired that his Conse-

* At his institution as Rector of Trinity Church, Bishop Griswold preached, taking for his text, St. John iii, 30: "*He must increase, but I must decrease;*" and what was very remarkable in a Preacher of Bishop Griswold's impersonal character, he closed the sermon by applying the text to the newly instituted Rector and himself.

cration should take place, was to assemble in New York in less than twelve days from that date. "On the 19th day of October," as he describes it in his first Episcopal Address, "convinced, on principles which have been, long since, deliberately adopted as the rules of my life, and by the concurring judgments of those who were best fitted to form an accurate decision in the premises, that such was my duty to His Church, Whose soldier and servant I am,—I communicated to the Committee my letter of acceptance, and on the thirty-first day of the same month, was consecrated to the Office of a Bishop in the Church of God, by the venerable and Right Rev. Dr. White, the Presiding Bishop, assisted by the Right Rev. Dr. Onderdonk, of New York, and the Right Rev. Dr. Ives, of North Carolina. That the solemnities of that day may be propitious to this our portion of the Vineyard of the Lord, and promotive, now and hereafter, of the Kingdom and glory of our Divine Redeemer, let me have, brethren, as I most truly need, your fervent and continual prayers." And then, after detailing his visitation of all the Parishes, he makes the following remarks. The extract is somewhat long, but it exhibits so clearly the principles and spirit with which he assumed the mitre, and, may we not say, is so prophetic of what was, under God, fulfilled by his Episcopate, that it will be read with renewed interest.

"It might seem to a hasty observer, whose eye should for a moment rest on the small space which the Diocese of New Jersey fills on the map of the United States, that it was a light work, and soon discharged. It does not so seem to me; nor can it to any thoughtful Christian. 'Jacob,' indeed, 'is small.' The territorial limits of the Diocese are soon passed over. Our Churches are few. Our parishes feeble. Our people poor. But how much larger was the land promised to the fathers of the old covenant, the scene of the wonders, and the cradle of the glories, of the new? How much more in number were the Churches of Christ, which even St. John lived to behold established in the earth? How much more rich or powerful, as the world accounts of power and riches, were the primitive flocks, whose sheep,—nay, whose inspired, and now glorified, pastors,—were 'destitute, afflicted, tormented, wandering in deserts and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth?' My brethren, reverend and beloved, I need not remind you, that there is no restraint to the Lord, to save by many or by few. I need not remind you that small as Jacob then was, he has arisen and filled the earth. 'Jacob,' indeed, 'is small.' Temporal power and splendor do not, and cannot, appertain to the Churches of this Diocese. What then? Are our efforts to be discouraged? Is our hope of influence or usefulness in the Church to be repressed? Are we hindered thus in the promoting of our Master's great work, the care and the salvation of souls? Directly the reverse. There is no circumstance, it seems to me,—and should the conviction be the result of that partiality which is natural to one's own, you will not greatly blame me,—there is no circumstance, it seems to me, peculiar to our condition, which does not favor the growth of primitive piety, and, therefore, of primitive prosperity. There are many circumstances which encourage us peculiarly to zeal, to fidelity, to perseverance, in setting forth the GOSPEL in the

CHURCH; in the sure confidence, that 'in due season, we shall reap if we faint not.' Is our Diocese small? It can, and ought to be better tended, watered, and cultivated. It is the less exposed to internal division and distraction. It is the more easily defended from external evil and injury. We are brought more nearly together. We feel, or ought to feel, more as brethren of one family. We can more easily 'stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the Gospel.' Are our parishes few and feeble! The sympathy of a good cause can the more easily pervade them. They offer nothing to tempt the ambitious or the worldly minded. Their equality with each other preserves them from envying and jealousy. Are our people poor? They have the less then to hinder their pursuit of the 'true riches.' They are the nearer to His condition, and the better prepared to receive His Gospel, 'who made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant.' They have the easier approach to His favor, who has 'chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which He hath promised to them that love Him.' Instead of repining then at our condition, or excusing ourselves from effort, on the ground that we can do so little, let us rather thank God that He has put it in our power to do so very much. . . . If it be asked then, 'how shall Jacob arise, for he is small?'—how shall we best improve the ability which God has given us, and bring forth richest fruit to His glory and the good of souls? I answer, by the diligent, faithful, constant exercise, with prayer to Him who alone can give the increase, of all the means which He has put in our hands. Small as our Diocese is, there are many fields 'white for the harvest,' that implore the sickle of the reaper. . . . All that is needed is the love of Christ to move us to the effort, faith to attempt, and to pursue it, and method, *Christian method*, in its prosecution."

No wonder that with such a spirit at its head, the Diocese of New Jersey should have become the center of much that is primitive and apostolic in our Branch of the Church. That an Episcopate, entered upon with such principles, could be an easy one, were not to be expected. He gave himself to his work. No one ever yet accused him of sparing himself. Everything that he had, his time, his talents, his thoughts, his personal ease, his peace of mind, his home, nay, even life itself, he freely lavished upon the flock which the Good Shepherd had committed to his care. No other Bishop, with a Diocese ten times the size of his, ever worked harder. He set out with the highest view of his Office and responsibilities, and, blessed with an energy and strength of constitution which few men possess, he labored to fulfill it by day and by night, in sunshine and in storm. His visitations were made always two, and generally three, a day, each morning administering the Holy Communion, being assisted only in the distribution of the consecrated elements, and at every Service catechising the children, preaching, and confirming. And frequently have we known him, in the midst of such laborious visitations, to work nearly the whole night with Committees on some matter for the good of the Church, and yet be the first up in the morning in the house at which he was entertained. Ordinarily he would work twenty hours out of the twenty-four, and then take his

rest in the remaining four wherever he might chance to be, on a sofa, or in the cars, or even a common country wagon, traveling from one point to another. Even in the earlier years of his Episcopate, when he had much less to do than later in life, he has been known to keep the printers in Burlington at work all night by paying double wages, and correct the proofs himself as they were brought to his library, hour by hour. An appointment once made was never broken, if it could by any possibility be fulfilled. He would travel in an open wagon, or drive, as we knew him to do on one occasion, nearly fourteen miles in an hour, through the most violent storm, to catch a train of cars, that he might be where he was expected. No heat or cold ever detained him. Only let him see that some duty could be performed for the Church, and no privation or difficulty deterred him from the task. He has crossed the Delaware, opposite his residence, in an open boat, when even the stout-hearted ferryman tried to dissuade him from the attempt. When on a Visitation in Monmouth County, intelligence was brought to him of the death of the Rev. Dr. Barry, his honored teacher, just previous to the Evening Service, with the request that he would preach the sermon at the funeral in Jersey City, the next day, at two o'clock; though it involved his returning to Burlington for some papers which could furnish him with dates, he immediately promised to do it; and then, after the Evening Service, which had been appointed, he drove a number of miles to meet the night freight train on the Camden and Amboy Railroad, rode in an empty freight car to Burlington, where he arrived at 2 A. M., wrote the Sermon, and left by the cars at 8 A. M., arriving in Jersey City in time to preach the Sermon, at the hour appointed, in the presence of a large gathering of the Clergy and Laity. And on his last Autumnal Visitation, he left the Board of Missions in Baltimore at 5 P. M., arriving in Elizabeth at 3 A. M. Friday, took but two hours rest, then had three full Services, catechising, confirming, and preaching at each, and was up the following night writing until after two o'clock, though he had three Services, and twenty-five miles of driving arranged for each of the two succeeding days. Thus did he toil day after day, and month after month, crowding into a short Episcopate of twenty-six years, the work of three lives rather than of one. And yet did he say of himself in all sincerity, in his last Triennial Charge, so little did he count all that he had done,

“When I read of Paul, the scholar of Gamaliel, the leader of the leaders of Jews, and *facile princeps*, among the master minds of every age, going down

from Athens, where he had confounded their philosophy, by his revelation, to them, of 'The unknown God,' to work at Corinth, as a tentmaker, that he might preach the Gospel, without charge, to any man; . . . when I behold that wondrous photograph of his eventful life, which his indignant zeal flashed in, upon that old Corinthian page, 'in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by my own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness;' 'of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one; thrice was I beaten with rods; once was I stoned; thrice I suffered shipwreck; a night and a day have I been in the deep;' 'in labors more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft;' 'besides those things which are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the Churches;'—when I contemplate these 'signs of an Apostle;' and consider, how little I have suffered, for the same Cross, how little I have done, and am doing, for the same suffering Lord, I sigh myself, into insignificance, and feel that I am not worthy to be called a Bishop: and, humbly pray, that He, the servant of Whose servants I desire to be, would enable me and dispose me to serve Him better, and make my service more promotive of the honor of His kingdom, and the glory of His Cross."

To describe Dr. Doane as a Bishop, we cannot do better than quote the remarkable words of Dr. Van Rensselaer, the noblest tribute which has been paid to his memory, and the more generous from the fact that the writer was the Bishop's theological opponent for many years, and that such a testimony was not demanded of him by his position. Of course we must make due allowance for the stand-point from which every Presbyterian must look upon the Episcopate, though we cannot but honor the heart that could thus bring his offering of May flowers to lay upon the new-made grave—"flowers plucked (in his own words) by a Puritan's hand, and placed *in memoriam* over the dust of a great Episcopal Bishop."

"As a Bishop, the departed Prelate will undoubtedly be acknowledged by his Church to be one of her greatest sons. So he was. He magnified his Office. His work was done on a great scale. He was personally everywhere in his own Diocese, and his writings were circulated widely in every other Diocese. He was the prominent man in the House of Bishops. He could outpreach, outvote, and outwork the whole of his brethren in the Episcopate. He was a sort of Napoleon among Bishops. It was after he crossed Alps of difficulties, that he entered upon the campaigns of his highest renown. The Bridge of Lodi, and the Field of Marengo, were to him the inspirations of heroism, and the rallying time of mightiest strategy. Bishop Doane was, perhaps, better adapted to the English Church than to the American. His Prelatical notions suited a monarchy more than a republic. In the House of Lords, he would have stood among the foremost of Lord Bishops. He of Oxford, would not have ranked before him of New Jersey. Bishop Doane was a good deal of an Anglican in his modes of thought and his views of Ecclesiastical Authority.* Had he lived in the days of

* Some seem to have supposed that he was more of an Englishman than an American, in his feelings. His persistent celebration of Washington's Birthday, and the Fourth of July, in his two Institutions for Christian Education, ought to have corrected this. In his Oration at Burlington College, on the Fourth of

Charles, he would have been a Laudean in Prelatical and political convictions; super-Laudean in intellect, and sub-Laudean in general Ecclesiastical temper. My own sympathies are altogether with the Evangelical, or Low-Church Bishops, as are those of the vast majority of this audience. I do not believe in the doctrines of lofty Church order, and transmitted grace, so favorably received in some quarters. But this is a free country; and the soul by nature is free, and has a right to its opinions, subject to the authority of the great Head of the Church. Bishop Doane had a right to his, and he believed himself to be, in a peculiar sense, a successor of the Apostles. He is one of the few American Bishops who has had the boldness to carry out his theory, and to call himself an Apostle. He delighted in his Office. Peter was to him the example of rigid adherence to the forms of the concision, whilst Paul was his example in enduring suffering for the extension of the Church. With an exalted view of his Office, he lived, and labored, and died. In this spirit, he encountered all his hardships and perils; and when, as in the case of danger in crossing the Delaware, he jumped into the frail skiff, inviting the ferryman to follow, it was in the same spirit of 'APOSTOLUM VEHIIS.' Bishop Doane was, in short, as complete a specimen of High-Church Bishop as the world has seen, and, in some respects, he was a model for any class of Bishops, at home or in mother England."

To this it is perhaps scarcely necessary to add that, in his own Diocese, he gave a helping hand to every effort, and quickened all with whom he came in contact, with his own energy and life. This was one secret of his magic influence over men. He had the power, to an extraordinary degree, of instilling into others the energy which he possessed himself. It was shown in his Diocese, in his Parish, in his College, in his Schools. "He came to a poor and feeble Diocese, and how soon he infused into it the energy of his own vitality! He went into an humble country Parish, with just life enough to save it from dissolution, and soon the Church became the center of life to the place, and the sickly plant grew into the vigorous tree. He took an old worn-out School which had expired in the hands of Friends, and he gave to it that wonderful life which has animated St. Mary's Hall." He could be a Bishop and do the work of two Bishops, the Rector of a large Parish, the President and working Head of two Insti-

July, 1851, '*Patriotism a Christian Duty*,' he thus speaks for himself: "I believe that Patriotism is a religious duty. I believe that it is to be taught, as such, from earliest childhood. I believe, that only second to their Saviour and His Church, our offspring should be trained to love and serve the land, which is their Providential heritage. And I would take these children now, and lay their hands upon the Altar which commemorates and certifies to their redemption, and demand their pledge, before the God who sees their heart, that they would never be the friend of him who would disturb this Union. I care not where he comes from, I care not what his plea be. As an American, I know no North, I know no South. One country is enough for me. '*Omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est.*' The country of the Union, the country of the Constitution, the country of the Stars and Stripes, that is my country. I go for it, all. I go for it, as one. I go for it, as indivisible. And I would sooner tear my quivering heart-strings from their core, than see one Pleiad lost from all that glorious constellation."

tutions, familiar with all the details of their discipline, assuming the entire charge of their instruction in Declamation and English Composition, and yet be foremost in the General Councils of the Church, active in every scheme for her advancement, on every Committee of importance, and withal constantly preparing material for the press. And yet, we venture to say that no Bishop ever knew personally more laymen of his Diocese, or was more attentive to all their joys and sorrows, than Bishop Doane. If but a friend were sick, or a child died, none were sooner to note it by letter or by his presence, than the Bishop. And incredible as it even yet seems, it was his regular custom, at his Visitations, to enquire, by name, for families and individuals belonging to the Parish, whom he had not observed present at the Service.

His Visitations had a character peculiar to himself. Though every Church received at least an annual visit, the Visitation was looked forward to, as an high day in the Parish. Old and young flocked to hear him preach, and none could be otherwise than gratified to see how all classes of the congregations stopped to speak with him after the Services, and receive his friendly greeting, or his blessing. On such occasions, he loved to have his Clergy about him; he would give all he could a part of the Services to perform, and never rest until an host was found to entertain them as long as they could stay. And seldom did a Visitation Service fail to gather not only the Clergy, but the leading Laity of all the neighboring Parishes, so that they were, without the name, Convocations, at which many a Pastor's hands were strengthened, and many a plan devised for the welfare of the Church. At every Visitation, if he could gather but a dozen children, he would catechise them "openly in the Church," in the presence of the congregation. In this, he was always very happy, and many lessons of faith and duty did he imprint, not only on the younger, but on the older hearts of the flock. His Confirmations were most impressively administered. He never "addressed the candidates," as he thought that it detracted from the deep solemnity of the Service; and we must say, that we have never been more deeply impressed with the Service than in the Diocese of New Jersey. His Episcopal Addresses also had a character peculiar to himself. Instead of a mere detail of so many Services performed, and so many Confirmations administered, they were freely interspersed with the incidents of his Visitation, acts of kindness which he had received, deeds of charity done for the Gospel's sake, and constant

hints as to how and where the cause he had at heart might be advanced. Nothing escaped his notice. If a congregation had struggled out of debt, or any improvement had been made in its Church edifice, it was certain to secure his attention. And he never seemed happier than when he could speak a word of commendation for any of his Clergy or their Parishes.

As a Rector, he was most indefatigable. Even with the "care of all the Churches" on his shoulders, few flocks were better tended than his Parish in Burlington. "He was (says one who knew him well) earnest, active, fertile in expedients, a faithful visitor of his people, and a friend of the poor. He seemed always to be in the right place at the right time. He went about doing good, and was known in Burlington as Rector, more than Bishop." His chief delight was to labor among the poor; and he left no greater mourners, outside of his immediate family, than among the poor of his Parish. His heart was in the Pastoral work, and he continued to perform the duties of a Rector until his death. A sweet little piece of Poetry, written by him in Northfield Vicarage, England, in 1841,* reveals this desire of his heart, and we cannot refrain from quoting it here :

"HOC ERAT IN VOTIS."

"This was in all my prayers since first I prayed,
A Parsonage, in a sweet garden's shade ;
The Church adjoining, with its ivied tower ;
A peal of bells, a clock to tell the hour ;
A rustic flock, to feed from day to day,
And kneel with them, at morn, and eve, and pray.
He, who 'doth all things well,' denied my prayer,
And bade me take the Apostle's staff and bear,
The scattered sheep o'er hill and dale pursue,
Feed the old flocks, and gather in the new ;
Count ease, and health, and life, and all things loss,
So I make known the blessed, bleeding Cross.
These quiet scenes, that never can be mine,
This homebred happiness, dear friend, be thine ;
Each choicest gift, and influence from above,
Descend on thee, and all that share thy love ;
Peace, which the world gives not, nor can destroy,
The prelibation of eternal joy."

* His visit to England was made in consequence of an invitation to preach at the Consecration of the Parish Church at Leeds, one of the finest Ecclesiastical structures of modern times. He was the first American Clergyman who was allowed to preach in an English pulpit, and during his visit did very much towards promoting that intimate intercourse which has since grown up between the mother and daughter Church.

As a Preacher, he possessed great power. He made it a rule to write one Sermon every week, and but one; and he has published more Sermons than any other three men in this country. Upon the greatest variety of topics, of every form which a Sermon can take, they will perpetuate his great intellectual power, consecrated to the GOSPEL IN THE CHURCH, and be an heritage of which the American Church will have reason to be proud. The felicity and clearness with which he divided his subject, the conciseness with which his thoughts were expressed, his perfect command of language, his power of word-painting, the variety and appropriateness of his illustrations, added to his powerful voice and energetic delivery, constituted him one of the first of pulpit speakers. Though many of them were written during the night preceding their delivery, or on Sunday morning before Service, they are as highly finished, as though he had spent days and weeks of labor upon them; and there is often more thought in one of his sentences than in pages of ordinary composition. Said a Clergyman to him, after hearing one of his Sermons, "Bishop, it always does me good to hear you preach; I can preach better, for it, for six months to come." His Sermon before the General Convention in Philadelphia, in 1856, was one of the triumphs of his life. The tone, the manner, the matter, made an indelible impression on all who heard it. At a time when the political horizon was darkened with the clouds of sectional strife, which threatened the dismemberment of the Union; when many did not hesitate to say that there never would be another *General Convention*, and when fears were excited for the preservation of the Prayer Book in its integrity, his words lifted men above themselves, as he dwelt upon "THE GLORIOUS CHURCH, the purchase and the purpose of Christ's death," and roused them up to their responsibility for its Faith, its Order, and its Worship. The vast Church was crowded with a congregation of more than three thousand persons, many of whom were compelled to stand; yet a pin might almost have been heard to drop during any part of the delivery of the Sermon; and when he closed with that noble peroration, which we are willing to place side by side with that of any pulpit orator in any age, so deep was the silence that you could hear yourself breathe. We venture to quote it, though, without his delivery and the occasion when it was spoken, it cannot be fully appreciated:

"A GLORIOUS CHURCH! Men, brethren, and fathers, shall we not feel it, in the action, and show it in the issues, of this sacred Council? Shall we not lay aside every prejudice? Shall we not lose sight of every personal, of every local, consideration? And, with a single eye to our great trust, in the promotion of

His Kingdom, Who bought us with His blood, seek nothing but His glory, in the salvation of the souls, for which He died? Oh, what a virtue will go out from us, if this shall be so! Oh, what an answer, to that blessed Eucharistic prayer, 'That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in us, that the world may believe, that Thou hast sent Me!' Oh, what a hastening of the time, when those fond yearnings of His heart shall all be realized: 'Father, I will, that they also, whom Thou hast given Me, be with Me where I am, that they may behold My glory, which Thou hast given Me!' Blessed, glorious hope! To see His glory! To see Himself! To see Him, as He is! To be like Him, because we see Him as He is!

"The issues of the Judgment Day are passed. The blast of the Archangel's trumpet, which waked all the dead, has died away, upon the air. The wailings of the lost are buried, with them, in the pit, which they digged for their own selves. The harpings of the Angels, all, are still. 'There' is 'silence, in Heaven!' One stands before us, in form, like unto the Son of Man; and, yet, His glory fills the Heavens. His hands are pierced; and, yet, they wield the sceptre of creation. His brow, still, shows the traces of the thorns; and yet it wears the crown of Heaven. His side drops blood; and, yet, it beats, with blessings, for the world, that pierced it. He stands, beside the Throne. He extends the arms, which once embraced the Cross. He takes, to His bursting breast, the spotless Spouse whom its own blood has washed. The Mediatorial work is done. The Marriage of the Lamb has come. He has presented, unto Himself, a 'glorious Church!' The conquest of the Cross is over. The coronation of the Crucified is consummated. 'Death is swallowed up in Victory!' And, 'God is all, in all!' Then, on the stillness at which Angels wondered, and which thrilled all Heaven with awe, like the voice of mighty thunderings, the song shall burst, which is to fill the echoes of eternity, forever and forever: 'Alleluia, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!' 'Blessed are they which are called to the Marriage Supper of the Lamb!' Holy and merciful Jesus, as Thou hast called us to Thyself, so, we beseech Thee, keep us ever Thine; and unto Thee, with the Eternal Father, and the ever blessed Spirit, three sacred Persons, and one only God, shall be ascribed all glory, and all praise, now and forever more. Amen."

As a Teacher, he also stood preëminent. From first to last, part of each week was spent in a School. He had a natural turn for children. Everywhere they ran to meet him, as "their own dear Bishop:" and his tact in teaching them, was universally acknowledged. He had but little faith in modern systems of education. The soul was, to him, a trust Divinely committed, and he held the teacher's accountability to God only second to that of the Pastor. Hence he would not give his support to any system which proposed to teach the hand and the head, without the heart. What he longed for, and labored for, was the old-fashioned Parochial School, *in* and *of* the Church. To this he recurs year after year, in his Episcopal Addresses, urging them upon his Diocese, with every argument in his power. And it was with him no mere theory. St. Mary's Hall, and Burlington College, are the standing monuments of his faith in Christian Education, and everywhere have their fruits been scattered over the land. "There are instances," says the Bishop of Missouri, "where

one woman, from St. Mary's Hall, has, under God, been the nucleus of a Church congregation in the wilderness."

"Had Bishop Doane," says Dr. Mahan, "no other title to a fair fame among men, the work that has been done within a few yards of Riverside, would be amply sufficient. Were there no other proof that he was a wise and good man, it would be amply enough to say, that he lived and labored twenty years under the scrutiny of those keen young eyes; that the more he was scrutinized by them, the more he was admired; that to the last day of his life, St. Mary's Hall, and Burlington College, believed in him, and loved him, with a confidence never shaken for a moment. Put an unreal man into a situation such as that, in a year, he would tire of it; in less than a year, it would be thoroughly tired of him. I regard it, therefore, as Bishop Doane's peculiar glory, his most solid title to the name of a true Shepherd, that all his life long he fed the lambs of Christ; that all his life long the lambs heard his voice, and followed him without fear. And his noblest service to the Diocese of New Jersey, is, that he has imbued it with the same spirit."

The Bishop's Address to the Graduating Class in St. Mary's Hall, in March last, the last thing he wrote, shows so clearly his perfect appreciation of the position of young Christian women in the world, contains so much timely counsel, and is so favorable a specimen of his peculiar style, that we reproduce a portion of it here.

"Again the old hive swarms. There is a flush of life, upon the grass. There is, scent of Spring, upon the air. The birds are twittering, back, to their old nests. The maple flings its crimson banner to the sky. The willow blushes, into green. The life-pulse can be stilled, no longer. The life-glow can, no longer, be repressed. There is a restless heaving of the mass. There is a hum. There is a flutter. There is a start. The old hive swarms, again. And they are off. Off, to the Northern hills. Off, to the Western prairies. Off, to the sweet savannahs of the South. Off, to sip sweetness from the flowers. Off, to hoard sweetness, for their homes. Off, to return, no more! It is the two and twentieth annual swarm. And I stand, here, to follow them, while eye can reach, to fold their precious memories, in my heart of love, to pursue them, with my blessing; and to shield them, with my prayers. Wherever, they may wing their wandering way, God guide them, keep them, comfort them! Poor things! They need it, all!"

Then, after alluding to "the pathways of that inner life, * * * whose issues are unchanging and eternal," he proceeds:

"My children, upon this devious and eventful pilgrimage, you are to enter, now; unshielded, by the sacred home, which has, so long, been your shelter. From its privacy, its peacefulness, its purity, its piety, the sound of its continual Scriptures, the music of its continual songs, the fervor of its continual supplications, the fragrance of its continual Sacraments, you are to go out into a world, which cares, but little, for these things. I thank God, for the inestimable confidence, that their roots, have taken in your hearts. I look, to Him, to water, with His grace, these plantings of His Word. I beseech Him, mercifully, to grant, that they may live, and grow, in you, nurturing your souls, with spiritual and immortal food; sheltering your young heads, with their broad, cool, shadow, against the hot blasts of temptation; and cheering you on, with their refreshing fragrance, through whatever He may order, for your chastening, as His children, until they bring you, where, the

palms of Paradise spring up, forever green, by the pure river of the water of life. Remember, my beloved, you have not these inestimable blessings for yourselves, alone. You hold them, as a sacred trust, for your homes, for the Church, for your country, and for your kind. 'The times are out of joint.' Corruption stalks in our high places. Licentiousness has, well nigh, lost its shame. Infidelity is bold and brazen-faced. The wave of barbarism is rolling back, upon us. For these things, your own sex is greatly answerable. Women are not true, to themselves. They wink at vice. They make a compromise with worldliness. They tolerate irreligion. And they are the victims of their own unfaithfulness. The stronger sex look up, in best things, to the weaker. They have, all, had mothers. They have, all, had sisters. They own them, in the sex, to which, they owe them. And, if women were but true, to God, true, to their position, true, to themselves, they would have strength, from Him, to hold the world, in check. No woman ever fell, but by her own consent. As, at the first, the woman is the tempter. There is no man, that has not passed into a brute, to do as tigers do, that can resist the matchless majesty of a resolved woman. And, stronger than all law, stronger than anything, but God, when it is strong, in His strength, would be the power of woman, to put down rudeness, and to lay the bridle, upon license. But the age is self-indulgent. And, self-indulgence, grows by what it feeds on. Women are occupied by fashion. Women are slaves, to dress. Women are willing to be flattered. Women are careless of their companionship. Women are unscrupulous, in their amusements. Young women set up for themselves. They look upon their parents, as old-fashioned. They are impatient of domestic restraints. They are averse to domestic occupations. They vote their home, a bore. They congregate away from its control. They indulge in unseasonable hours. They meet the other sex, more than half way. They make themselves debtors, for their escort, to places of resort. They permit the approaches of familiarity. They tempt the hidden devil of their nature. They forget their Bibles. They neglect their Prayer Books. They are women of fashion. They are women of the world. What else they are is, rather shaped, by opportunity, than themselves. In this way, home is stripped of its sanctity. In this way, the female atmosphere loses its freshness and its fragrance. The woman is, no longer, what she was made to be; 'a helpmeet' for the man. And man ceases to be, what God designed him for; her partner, her prop, and her protector.

"I am well persuaded, by the report, which comes, to me, from every quarter of the land, that the women, who have gone out, from before this altar—counted now, by thousands—are, for the most part, women of another sort. I hear of them, as faithful wives. I hear of them, as devoted mothers. I hear of them, as loving sisters. I hear of them, as obedient daughters. They are centers, of good influence in society. They are stays and ornaments of the Church. It may be said, of them: 'Many daughters have done virtuously; but, these excel them all.' To join this hopeful company, beloved ones, you are to go out, now. You go, with the instructions, by which their minds were moulded. You go, with the influences, which God has sanctified, in the transformation of their hearts. You go, with the prayers, which have won down, from heaven, for them, the consolations of the Comforter. You go, with the blessing, which has commended them, to the care and keeping of the Holy One. 'Be strong, in the Lord,' dear children: 'and in the power of His might.' Keep your Bibles, ever, in your hearts. Have your Prayer Books, ever, in your hands. Be true, to yourselves. Be true, to your Church. Be true, to your God. Follow after her, who sat down, at Jesus' feet, and heard His word. Follow after them, who left His Cross, the last; and found His grave, the first. Follow after her, whose sacred legend gleams upon you, now; it may be, for the last time: 'behold the handmaid of the Lord.* Remember, always, that you are women. Remember, always, to be 'holy women.' Keep your hands, ever, on the Cross. Fix your eyes, ever, on

* The legend in the chancel window of the Chapel of the Holy Innocents, attached to St. Mary's Hall.

the crown. Lambs of THE LAMB, in meekness, and gentleness, and lovingness; be doves of THE DOVE, in peace, and purity, and piety. Dear daughters of my heart, God bless you."

As a Writer, his ability was of the highest order. He was the Chrysostom, or Jeremy Taylor, of our times. With a style peculiarly his own, and a punctuation as unique as his style,* he could express more thoughts, in fewer words, and never be misunderstood, than any man we have ever met. He held emphatically the pen of a ready writer, and he would prepare more matter, ready for the press, in six hours, than most persons in as many days. At home in the best English literature, with a mind clear and vivid, ever ready with its stores of varied learning, and always equaling the occasion which called him forth, he would have shone conspicuous in any department of literature and science to which his time had been given. If a preacher failed to meet his appointment for the Board of Missions or any other prominent occasion, who but he could be relied upon to prepare a new Sermon with less than twelve hours' notice? What other man would, or could, have stood up in Trinity Church, New York, before the leading men of the city, at the Atlantic Telegraph Celebration, and held that immense assemblage enchained with an address, which was telegraphed to every city in the Union, when by some accident, the first intelligence he received of his being expected to deliver this address, was a newspaper reporter asking the loan of his manuscript, as he entered the Church just before the Service?† And who but he could sit, as he often did, in the House of Bishops, continually writing letters, paying apparently no attention to what was before the House, and all of a sudden rise up in the midst of an exciting debate, and with a speech which showed that he had heard every word that had been uttered, probe the subject to the very bottom, whether it were a question on the practical working of the Church, or of abstruse Canonical Law? With some persons this constant readiness was supposed to argue a superficial character to his mind. As if that were a superficial mind, to which the first Lawyers in the land were some-

* It is but justice to him to say that his punctuation was the result of carefully considered rules which he laid down for himself, and it may not have been noticed that some portions of the Holy Scriptures, particularly the New Testament, (for there is in the different books great variety,) are punctuated in a manner very similar to the Bishop's writings.

† He went to the Church, expecting to be called upon, with other speakers, to make a few remarks appropriate to the occasion, but had no idea that there would be devolved upon him the duty of making the only address.

times compelled to yield, even on their own ground, and which, in debate, could hold at bay the ablest men in the Church. One who knew him well, and had a right to speak, does not hesitate to bear this testimony :

" His learning was extensive, accurate, and thorough. His intellect penetrated, to the bottom, every subject which he handled; and with such *rapidity* that slower minds may, hastily, have thought him *superficial*. But he was not so. He had, and could always bring to bear, the practical *results* of learning, while others no more learned than he are weighed down with the mere acquirements of the knowledge which they cannot use. Mere bookish men—not practical—not useful, and not great—but whom the unthinking call *profound*, because they are *heavy*! He *packed* his knowledge well. It was well *sorted*—well *distributed*; and he walked so easily along, with all his load of varied learning, that lesser minds—(whose bundles of *loose faggots* make the bearers stagger, and it may be, sometimes scratch the crowd) may have supposed his burden was not equal to their own."

As a Poet, if his time had not been given so entirely to the pursuits of his Sacred Office, he would undoubtedly have ranked very high. In 1824 he published a little volume, entitled "Songs by the Way," chiefly of a devotional character. Perhaps one of the best pieces in it is the following :

ON A VERY OLD WEDDING RING.

The Device—Two hearts united.

The Motto—"Dear love of mine, my heart is thine."

" I like that ring—that ancient ring,
Of massive form, and virgin gold.
As firm, as free from base alloy,
As were the sterling hearts of old.
I like it—for it wafts me back,
Far, far along the stream of time,
To other men, and other days,
The men and days of deeds sublime.

" But most I like it, as it tells
The tale of well-requited love;
How youthful fondness persevered,
And youthful faith disdain'd to rove,—
How warmly *he* his suit preferr'd,
Though *she*, unpitying, long denied,
Till, soften'd and subdued, at last,
He won his 'fair and blooming bride.'

" How, till the appointed day arrived,
They blamed the lazy-footed hours,—
How then the white-robed maiden train
Strewed their glad way with freshest flowers—
And how, before the holy man,
They stood in all their youthful pride,
And spoke those words, and vow'd those vows,
Which bind the husband to his bride.

- "All this it tells; the plighted troth—
 The gift of every earthly thing—
 The hand in hand—the heart in heart—
 For this I like that ancient ring.
 I like its old and quaint device;
 'Two blended hearts'—though time may wear them,
 No mortal change, no mortal chance,
 'Till death,' shall e'er in sunder tear them.
- "Year after year, 'neath sun and storm,
 Their hopes in heaven, their trust in God,
 In changeless, heartfelt, holy love,
 These two the world's rough pathway trod.
 Age might impair their youthful fires,
 Their strength might fail, mid life's bleak weather,
 Still, hand in hand they traveled on—
 Kind souls, they slumber now together.
- "I like its simple poesy too;
 'Mine own dear love, this heart is thine!'
 Thine, when the dark storm howls along,
 As when the cloudless sunbeams shine,
 'This heart is thine, mine own dear love!'
 Thine, and thine only, and forever;
 Thine, till the springs of life shall fail,
 Thine, till the cords of life shall sever.
- "Remnant of days departed long,
 Emblem of plighted troth unbroken,
 Pledge of devoted faithfulness,
 Of heartfelt, holy love the token:
 What varied feelings round it cling!
 For these I like that ancient ring."

The lines on "*What is that, Mother?*" are too well known to be quoted here. We add another piece, also from "*Songs by the Way*," which strikes us as of the highest merit:

THEMOPYLÆ.

- "'Twas an hour of fearful issues,
 When the bold three hundred stood,
 For their love of holy freedom,
 By that old Thessalian flood;
 When, lifting high each sword of flame,
 They call'd on every sacred name,
 And swore, beside those dashing waves,
 They never, never would be slaves.
- "And, O, that oath was nobly kept;
 From morn to setting sun
 Did desperation urge the fight,
 Which valor had begun;
 Till, torrent-like, the stream of blood
 Ran down and mingled with the flood,
 And all, from mountain cliff to wave,
 Was Freedom's, Valor's, Glory's grave.

"O, yes, that oath was nobly kept,
Which nobly had been sworn,
And proudly did each gallant heart
The foeman's fetters spurn ;
And firmly was the fight maintain'd,
And amply was the triumph gain'd ;
They fought, fair Liberty, for thee ;
They fell—TO DIE IS TO BE FREE."

A few years since he edited the First American edition of Keble's Christian Year, with valuable notes of his own ; but he has published no second volume of poetry. His poems have all been literally *Songs by the Way*, thrown off in the midst of his toils and trials. Our space allows us to quote but two more.

ROBIN REDBREAST.

"I have somewhere met with an old legend, that a robin, hovering about the Cross, bore off a thorn from our dear Saviour's crown, and dyed his bosom with the blood ; and that, from that time, robins have been the friends of man.

"Sweet Robin, I have heard them say,
That thou wert there, upon the day,
That CHRIST was crown'd in cruel scorn,
And bore away one bleeding thorn,
That, so, the blush upon thy breast
In shameful sorrow, was impressed ;
And thence thy genial sympathy,
With our redeemed humanity.

"Sweet Robin, would that I might be,
Bathed in my SAVIOUR'S blood like thee ;
Bear in my breast, whate'er the loss,
The bleeding blazon of the Cross ;
Live, ever, with thy loving mind,
In fellowship with human kind ;
And take my pattern still from thee,
In gentleness and constancy."

STAND LIKE AN ANVIL.

"Stand like an anvil, when it is beaten upon ;" St. Ignatius to St. Polycarp, both martyrs.

"Stand like an anvil!" when the strokes
Of stalwart strength fall fierce and fast
Storms but more deeply root the oaks,
Whose brawny arms embrace the blast.

"Stand like an anvil!" when the sparks
Fly far and wide, a fiery shower ;
Virtue and truth must still be marks,
Where malice proves its want of power

"Stand like an anvil!" when the bar
Lies red and glowing on its breast ;
Duty shall be life's leading star,
And conscious innocence, its rest.

“‘Stand like an anvil!’ when the sound
Of ponderous hammers pains the ear;
Thine be the still and stern rebound
Of the great heart that cannot fear.

“‘Stand like an anvil!’ noise and heat
Are born of earth, and die with time.
The soul, like God, its Source and Seat,
Is solemn, still, serene, sublime.”

In Private Life he was the most disinterested, the most unselfish of men. All that he had, and all that he was, were at the service of his friends. He would give away the last flower that he had, if he thought any one wanted it. No man ever had greater temptations to live a life of ease and social enjoyment. With every worldly surrounding that could make life happy, he loved his home more than any man we ever knew; yet nothing pleased him more than to have others partake of its hospitality. Who, that ever entered Riverside, went away other than delighted? There was a simple, generous reality about him, which won the heart. You saw him just as he was. There was no deception in his character, and as little malice. Whatever others might say of him, however hard they might treat him, no one ever heard him speak of them vindictively, and no one can say with justice that he ever cherished any ill feeling toward those who were lacerating his heart. Though no woman's heart ever felt harshness more keenly, yet, when stung to the quick in the house of his friends, the only sign which he gave to those who knew him best, was the relief which they found him seeking by some little gem of verse, with the well-known signature, G. W. D. When, in the midst of his trials, not a family could be found, in Burlington, to entertain, during the sitting of the Diocesan Convention, a Clergyman, who had most violently opposed him, he invited him to his own house. When, arraigned before his peers, he was pleading for that which was dearer to him than life, and harsher words were uttered than most men would have endured, no expression escaped from his lips, (is the testimony of a Bishop who was entirely impartial,) of which he would have reason to be ashamed before the Judgment Bar. Charity, magnanimity, and good will, were written on all that he said and on all that he did.

But his chief delight, his greatest comfort, his never-failing source of strength and consolation, was in continual prayer. “He gave himself,” reverently be it said, “unto prayer.” He was always “glad to go into the House of the Lord.” When his family were scattered, and only a little grandchild could be

found to pray beside him, still he never failed, the first thing in the morning, to kneel down with her and ask God's blessing on his household. Of such an occasion, he once remarked, in his simple way, "I never felt so near the angels." And no matter how pressing his cares, how innumerable his duties, he always found time to be twice, and frequently three or four times, daily, at the Services of the Lord's House. It was no uncommon thing for him, when the other Clergy were away, to read the Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, both at the Parish Church and in the Chapel of St. Mary's Hall, in addition to the usual Noonday Service at the latter, at which he was always present when at home. Here was the great secret of his strength. He realized the comfort and consolation of prayer. At these living wells he refreshed his drooping spirit in the days of his darkest sorrow. Often have we heard him lament that so few of those who profess and call themselves Churchmen, could be made to feel the privilege of the Public Daily Prayer. And, in the hour of his conflict with the last enemy, he again bore his most impressive witness in its behalf, "vindicating it by argument and eloquent appeals, as a fountain of health, an unfailing source of wide-spread spiritual blessing."

But perhaps the most remarkable trait in his character was the boldness with which he proclaimed what he felt to be the truth. There was no compromise of principle, nor yielding to mere expediency, in his life. Though fond of praise, exceedingly sensitive to blame, and always anxious for the approval of his friends, yet let him once make up his mind on any subject as to his path of duty, and no friend or foe could swerve him a hair's-breadth from his purpose. He set out, as we have said, with the highest view of the duties and responsibilities of his Office, and he maintained it unto the end. We had intended to have illustrated this by the manner in which he battled with, cost him what it might, many of the popular opinions of the day. For example, he did not believe in "Brotherhoods" in the Church, and did all he could to oppose the Ordination of unlearned Deacons. But we must confine ourselves to one subject, his opposition to the present popular system of the Sunday School. *Ex uno disce omnia.* As long ago as 1843, he thus stated his objections to them in an Address to his Convention,—objections which, we venture to say, have been painfully realized in the experience of every Pastor who has carefully observed the results of the system.*

* The Bishop's views on this subject will be found more fully developed in an Article he read before the Commission of Bishops, on the late Memorial of Dr. Muhlenburg, and published in the volume of Memorial Papers, in 1856.

"I should be sorry to think of the Sunday School, as such, as a permanent idea in the Church. I do not care to see it stereotyped in brick and mortar. It is the offspring of a superficial, labor-saving, self-sparing age. It has done some good, but hindered more, and brought with it much mischief. It has taken off from parents and sponsors, the sense of their responsibility in the religious care of children. It has cheated Pastors with the notion of an easier way of doing, what Jesus laid on Simon, as the highest test of love, the feeding of His lambs. It has puffed up multitudes with the conceit of knowledge, and almost of a new order in the Church. And it has substituted in the minds of children, the most superficial smattering, for that sound, patient, thorough instruction in the faith and practice of the Gospel, which Christ entrusted to His Church, for which He holds her accountable, and for which she makes the fullest and most adequate provision. How could it be otherwise? What office more responsible and difficult than that of teacher? For the Christian teacher, what long probation, what various acquirements, what careful preparation, what thorough scrutiny; and, when all these are done, the solemn laying on of an Apostle's hands, with invocation of the Holy Spirit? But, for the teachers of the Sunday School,—teachers, Christian teachers, the first Christian teachers, after their mothers, of the rising generation; whose privilege and opportunity it is to forestall the ministry, and give the first shape to their work,—whoever thinks of asking for any other qualification than willingness to undertake the office! In a Parish, which, with difficulty, finds one man to be the teacher of the men and women, twenty, thirty, fifty, in spontaneous growth, spring up to be the teachers of the children. Can they be qualified? Is it just to expect it of them? Is it safe to entrust it to them? And then, their opportunity! One, two, or at most, three hours, in any week—I had almost said, thinking what day it is, the more, the worse,—crowded in upon the proper duties, and maiming the precious privileges of the day of sacred rest: making a working day of it, a very treadmill of tasks, and teachers, and school books, and school rooms; a dismal day of drudgery, instead of the sweet, calm sabbath of the soul! Who could expect from nine days in a year—and more cannot be made of it—distributed at such disadvantage, any valuable result of knowledge or of discipline? Who will be answerable for the effects, in after life, of such associations, on the observance of the sacred day? Who could expect, from means so questionable, a valuable result? Who must not fear from grounds so neglected, the rankest overgrowth of irreverence and insubordination, of error and false doctrine, of heresy and schism? Does any ask, what is the substitute proposed? The natural, the reasonable, the divine provision. Children are born of parents. They are new born, with sponsors. To these, the first responsibility belongs. It cannot be delegated, it cannot be escaped from, it cannot be neglected, without fearful consequences, in time, and through eternity. But, though the first and chief, these are not the whole reliance. There comes in, as their delegated auxiliary, the Christian school master or mistress; the Parish school, as the joint nursery, to train the minds and hearts of children of one neighborhood. A Christian school; as it is sanctified by daily prayer. A Christian school; as Christian doctrines, and Christian duties, are among its daily themes. A Christian school; as it is taught by those who, in word, and deed, and good example, are tried Christians. A Christian school; as its design is to train Christians for whatever state of life it may please God to call them to. A Christian school; as it is under the entire control, and enjoys the constant supervision of the Christian Pastor. And, finally, the Christian Pastor's chiefest work, the catechising 'openly in the Church,' of the children, who, in the Parish school, are thoroughly instructed in the Catechism; and his preparation of them, in full and strict compliance with the requirements of the Rubrics, to be 'brought to the Bishop, to be confirmed by him.' This is the Church's plan. An old plan. A tried plan. A sure plan. It is wise in its provisions. It is responsible in its agencies. It is safe in its results. It is the plan of the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Holy Scriptures. It is God's plan, and it has the promise of His blessing. But it is old fashioned; it is troublesome; it is expensive; and so the Sunday School comes in, and crowds it out. Why stay in that old, dull, dry,

beaten road, when the new, short-cut, is so much more attractive? Why trouble the parents, and the sponsors, and the Pastor, with the care of children, when there are others to come in, and take it off their hands? Why provide a Parish school house, and maintain a parochial teacher, and multiply Ministers to be supported, when it can all be done for nothing? And this is an age which calls itself utilitarian! A new name, for what our forefathers, in their plain way, described, as 'penny-wise, pound-foolish.' The Christian care of children, to be faithfully discharged, calls for the establishment of thorough Christian schools, accessible to every child, in every Parish; and also calls for the increase of Clergy, so that every Parish Minister, who has the care of fifty to an hundred families, shall have at least one Deacon, to assist him in his duties. Men may refuse to do this, for a while; and will, most probably: although the morning of a better day is spread upon the mountains. And, while this is so, a Sunday School, carefully superintended by the Minister himself, taught by none whom he does not himself select, admitting no text-books but the Bible and the Prayer Book, and constantly subordinate to his stated catechising, 'openly in the Church,' may be of use, as a mere monitorial assistant in his labors.*

That Bishop Doane had his faults, no man will deny, and no one could have been more ready to admit it than himself. He was, as has been justly said, "strongly, manifoldly, perilously human." Like St. Peter, he was impulsive to the last degree. Like him, his faults were all upon the surface, known and seen of all men. With the most intense reality of character, he knew nothing of acting for the sake of appearance. He never could be made to understand the necessity of guarding against misrepresentation and misconstruction. That he had his enemies, was but the natural result of such a character. That many of them acted from the purest (though mistaken) motives, we have no disposition to deny. That he was often harshly judged, and frequently calumniated, most persons are now willing to admit. Though convinced, by intimate intercourse with him for several years, of the entire purity of his motives, it is not our purpose to enter into the particulars of his various accusations. History will put them in their proper light. We simply desire to place on record the just conclusion of Dr. Van Rensselaer, certainly an impartial judge, and one who had known and studied him, as a near neighbor, for twenty-three years. He says:

"There are three remarkable facts, which serve to commend, and to enforce charity, over his grave.

"In the first place, Bishop Doane's most intimate friends believed him innocent. Judges, lawyers, physicians, divines, intimate acquaintances, male and female, by scores and thousands, have placed the most implicit confidence in his motives and integrity.

"In the second place, his Church, in its Diocesan and General Convention, was

* There are large Sunday Schools, bearing the name of the Church, in which the Church Catechism never is taught. When a conscientious teacher, in one of our City Schools, introduced it, it was ordered out by the Superintendent, a Layman, as "unsound in doctrine."

never against him. Indeed, the House of Bishops formally declared his innocence; and this is presumptive proof that his religious character could not be impugned in the Church to which he belonged.

"In the third place, it cannot be denied that God showed no little favor to the Bishop in life and in death. He enabled him to accomplish a large amount of good; protected him in Providence from a varied and powerful opposition; and permitted him, after a long life of labor and trial, to die in peace.

"These three facts just mentioned, do not amount to absolute demonstration; but they must pass for all they are fully worth. To a person, like myself, outside of his Church, and an unexcited observer of passing events in the community, they afford evidence of no slight character. I am thankful, this day, that I have never felt it in my power to pass a severe judgment, in view of the whole aspect of the case, so far as it has been presented to my mind. I have seen enough, however, and have heard enough, to make me say with David, 'Let us fall into the hand of the Lord, for His mercies are great; but let me not fall into the hand of man.'

That these trials prematurely whitened his locks, and shortened his life, every one must feel. But that he never quailed before them,* or ceased, the moment the storm had passed, to devote himself with still intenser energy to the manifold labors of his Episcopate, is one of the most remarkable features of his remarkable life. That noble saying of St. Augustine, "*Vincit qui patitur*," was a great favorite with him; and he acted out the exhortation of St. Ignatius to his brother martyr, Polycarp, "Stand like an anvil when it is beaten upon." Whatever fell upon him, he never swerved for an instant from what he felt to be the path of duty and of right. "RIGHT ONWARD," was the chosen motto of his public and private life. The principle which he so fearlessly and inflexibly pursued, amid so much misrepresentation and abuse, is one that was but little understood. But the day is not far distant when men will yet thank God for the stand he then maintained. It is ably described in the Sermon of Dr. Mahan:

* The only exception, which can by any possibility be made to this, was that one "heart-wound," which went "with him," alas, "to the grave, and brought him sooner there." We allude to the submission of his first born, as he expressed it, "to the schismatical Roman intrusion." It was the sorrow of his life, which "brought [him] to know what that means, of which we read in Holy Scriptures, about cutting off the right hand, and plucking out the right eye." The statement which he made of the case, in his Episcopal Address of 1856, which brought tears to many eyes, we should have been glad to have found room for here; but we must content ourselves with quoting two sentences from it, and ask, with him, "the prayers of the faithful in Christ Jesus, that his erring child may be brought back to the way of Truth and Peace." He forcibly said for himself, "I challenge contradiction, when I assert that there is not a house on earth, that can be less imbued with sympathy with Rome, than that in which he lived for five and twenty years. And for myself, of all the falsehoods which have ever been imagined and alleged, a tendency towards Rome, is the one, which my deepest impressions, and clearest conclusions, not only, but the very instincts of my nature, make impossible."

"A man who lives for the public, whether in Church or State, who is much in the public eye, whose heart and brain are continually overtaken in the public service, labors, so far as his own good fame is concerned, under a double disadvantage. He is more exposed than other men to the shafts of calumny. He is less able than other men to guard and defend himself. Every hour that he gives to self-vindication, is so much taken from the cause to which all his time is devoted. For this reason, the true public man is bound in conscience to endure in magnanimous silence what to other men would seem simply unendurable. A sentinel cannot leave his post to chastise the insolence of the mob. A shepherd cannot leave his flock to answer the challenge of the wolf. In the same way, a public man, when he is assailed by accusations, true or false, is at liberty to meet them only in one way, and on one spot. He cannot go forth to meet them. They must come and meet him. They must come before him in a legally binding, responsible and authoritative shape. Thus our Lord, before Caiaphas, answered never a word until solemnly *adjured by the living God*; and when questioned by Pilate, declined answering till fully assured whether Pilate *spoke of himself*, that is, magisterially; or merely uttered the idle questions of others. On the same principle, St. Polycarp declined to plead his cause before the crowd, because, as he alleged, they had no lawful commission to judge him. The public man, in fact, has a public cause to sustain. To that he is wholly pledged. His own cause, therefore, except so far as the vindication of it is forced upon him by due process of legal adjuration, he leaves to God, to time, to the sure, though slow instinct of justice in the human heart.

"This, my brethren, is the principle on which I believe Bishop Doane to have acted from the beginning to the end of that storm of accusation which has of late years raged against him. For one, I thank God that he saw the importance of this principle, so clearly; that he acted on it so firmly. At a time when irresponsible accusation is becoming more and more a great power in the land, the man who refuses to bow to it, who at his own peril holds up against it the standard of time-honored law, is doing good service both to the Church and country.

"Bishop Doane saw this. And when, in the face of a wide-spread clamor, and even against the wishes of many of his friends, he declared that he would do what he could *to make the trial of a Bishop hard*, he may, indeed, have injured his own cause for a while, in public opinion, but he at the same time delivered his own soul; he expressed honestly and boldly a settled and sound conviction."

But we must pass on from this imperfect sketch, leaving much that invites our pen, to his last illness and death. Like his life, it was so ordered, in God's good Providence, that it should be before the world. It can only be compared to one of those glorious sunsets, when the sun, having come forth from the clouds which had obscured it for a while, goes down in its full splendor, burnishing its pathway with every golden hue. So did his death scene surround his hoary head with a crown of glory, which shall never fade so long as his name is mentioned among men.

He left home on Friday, April 8th, to make his Visitation in Monmouth County. He had been suffering from a severe cold, and for the first time in his life it was remarked by his family that he expressed an unwillingness to go. Still he fulfilled

his appointments, preaching three times each day, though compelled, on part of the Visitation, to travel in a country wagon, through a heavy rain. Those who heard him, speak of the energy with which he delivered his Sermons, though suffering so much from rheumatism that he rose from his knees only with difficulty. On Tuesday, he returned home to attend the funeral of the Rev. Mr. Morehouse, the Senior Presbyter of the Diocese, at Mount Holly, on the following day. After partaking of a slight repast, he lay down on his bed, with no expectation of recovery, and, as he believed from the first, a dying man. His disease assumed a typhoid form, accompanied, during its earlier stages, by incessant nausea, which gave him great distress; yet no word of complaint was heard from his lips. He acquiesced in everything prescribed by his faithful attendants, though, through all, insisting that they would be of no avail. On one occasion when his devoted physician, who scarcely left him night or day, begged him to exercise his wonted energy and will, to aid the efforts of nature; his only reply was, that he had neither energy nor will, and could not *create* either.

During the Holy Week, the fever reached its height, and delirium ensued; a delirium which can only be described as *sublime*. His mind, retaining all its usual energy and power, was simply "unveiled." Not an undignified word or improper expression was spoken. The great heart which had so long struggled on the Lord's side, was merely running on in its accustomed channels; the Christian warrior—the ruling passion strong in death—was fighting his battles o'er again; the work of his life still the theme of all his thoughts. In those three days Sermons were preached with all his former eloquence, addresses of touching tenderness made to his theological class or the young ladies of St. Mary's Hall, earnest appeals to the Convention on topics of interest to the Diocese, his character vindicated from the charges which had been made against it, and the most logical arguments and remonstrances uttered against the corruptions of the schismatical Church of Rome. Those present who had revered and loved him for years, were never more deeply impressed with his greatness and goodness than during those hours which opened his inmost heart to the world.

As Easter-tide came in, his mind assumed its usual balance. Calm, submissive, quiet, and almost playful as of old, hopes of his recovery were aroused in all but himself. Though very feeble, he sent for some of his friends and gave them directions and requests in reference to his public and personal

affairs. On Easter-Tuesday, unfavorable symptoms again awakened the alarm of the family. In accordance with a promise which he had exacted from his physician in the early part of the attack, he was now informed that they believed him to be sinking. And then, the only calm person in that bereaved house, the few remaining hours of his life were occupied in devout meditations, in receiving the Holy Communion, which was administered to him and the other members of the family by his son, the Rev. William Crosswell Doane, in expressing his charity for all, and sending messages of kindness and blessing to the absent. When everything else was done, there flowed from his lips that noble Confession of his Faith, true to such a life, and worthy of an Apostle of the Lamb:

"I DIE IN THE FAITH OF THE SON OF GOD, AND IN THE CONFIDENCE OF HIS ONE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH. I HAVE NO MERITS—NO MAN HAS—BUT MY TRUST IS IN THE MERCY OF JESUS."*

And then, when faith had triumphed, love came in to complete the work. With his last strength he raised his trembling hands and pronounced over his afflicted family the beautiful Levitical Benediction, from the Office for the Visitation of the Sick: "Unto God's gracious mercy and protection, we commit thee. The Lord bless thee, and keep thee. The Lord make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace, both now and evermore." And so he fell asleep in Jesus, and rested from his labors, at one o'clock in the afternoon of Wednesday, in Easter Week, 27th of April, A. D. 1859, within one month of sixty years of age.

Few men, not martyrs, have given or suffered more for the Church, than he did. A purer minded, a greater and a more misrepresented man, we have never met, and posterity will acknowledge it. "Few Fathers of the Church, when

* This has, by some who did not know the Bishop, been represented as though he gave up all thoughts of the Church when he came to die—in one word, professed a different faith from that he had preached. Perhaps the best answer to this is his Sixth Triennial Charge, 1848, "Christ crucified, the hope, the theme, the model of the Christian minister," in which these words occur: "*Our only rescue is the refuge of the Cross. The fountain opened to our souls, for sin and for uncleanness, flows from the pierced heart of Him Who suffered there. And to be gathered at His bleeding feet; and look, with smitten souls, upon the agony that wrings His yearning frame; and take into our hearts, cut through with penitential shame, the unction of His blood; this is our only cleansing, our only health.*" Those who knew him well, see in this last Confession of his Faith, an epitome of his preaching and his life.

they pass away, (said the Bishop of Georgia,) will leave as many hearts to mourn over their graves, or as many eyes that will water them with their tears." And yet he died, says Dr. Van Rensselaer, in the right time. God had spared his life until he had outlived all that had been said against him; there was no man openly to accuse him; his honors had returned; men began to gather again about him; primitive piety, for which he had so earnestly longed in his first Episcopal Address, had grown in his Diocese beyond his most ardent expectations; the number of his Clergy had increased from eighteen to one hundred; his work was done; and God took him to Himself.

The Funeral Solemnities must not remain unnoticed. The Standing Committee of the Diocese had assumed their whole charge, and everything was arranged with as much simplicity as possible. There was none of the pomp and show of grief; and yet it was *the triumph* of his life. No one who saw it can ever forget it. The sun shone forth in all its vernal beauty, and the day was one of those sudden outbursts of Spring, which seem to quicken all nature to a renewed life. The body was laid out in the Episcopal robes, in a coffin of the ancient shape, covered with purple cloth, and having on its lid a plain Cross. A small Cross was also laid upon his breast, and the flowers, which he so loved to have around him, were strewn about the body. From early morning, vast numbers of the citizens, and strangers from a distance, came to take their last look on all that remained to them of their beloved Bishop. At one o'clock, the coffin was covered with an appropriate purple pall, with a white Cross dividing it into four equal parts, and on it was laid the Bishop's crozier, which had been sent to him as a gift by English friends, and on that a wreath of violets. The body, preceded by the officiating Bishops, was borne on a bier all the way to the Church, and as the pall fluttered in the breeze, its white Cross seemed to be hovering just over the coffin. Sixteen pall-bearers, (the Standing Committee of the Diocese, and Delegates to the General Convention,) with scarfs tied with purple ribbon, walked on either side, and the body was followed, after the mourning family, first, by nearly one hundred Clergy of the Diocese and other Dioceses, in their surplices, with heads uncovered; then, by the students of Burlington College, and the young ladies of St. Mary's Hall, all dressed in the deepest mourning; and then, by a long line of citizens and friends, including the Governor, and other dignitaries of the State, and

delegations from the Vestries, not only of many Churches in the Diocese, but also of New York and Pennsylvania, all of whom had gathered, without any special invitation, to do honor to the lamented dead. The windows of nearly every house past which the body was borne, had the shutters barred and hung with a piece of crape, and, as the procession slowly moved along the green bank of the Delaware, every bell in the city tolling, the scene was one of sublime solemnity. "Everything was as *impressive as life and death could make it.*" As the procession entered the Church Yard, and moved through the dense crowd to the Church, the sentences of the Burial Service were said by the venerable Dr. Berrian. The bier was placed in the center of the Chancel, the Clerical pall-bearers remaining standing on either side. The large Church, which was draped throughout with purple and black, was soon filled in every part, though not one-third of the procession was able to enter. After the Psalm, which was chanted, and the Lesson, which was read by Bishop Southgate, the Priestly pall-bearers took up the corpse and bore it to the grave. The Service for the grave was then said by the Bishop of Vermont and the Provisional Bishop of New York, the Anthem being sung by three of the Clergy. It was estimated that there were more than three thousand persons about the grave. Such grief we have never witnessed. The Prayers could scarcely be heard for the sobs of the mourners. Old and young, the surpliced Priests, the leading Laity of the Diocese, who had stood by the Bishop in all the labors and trials of his Episcopate, the chief men of the State, the graduates of St. Mary's Hall and Burlington College, the citizens of Burlington, the poor and needy whom he had so long befriended, and even the colored population, who came with their little ones, all seemed to mingle in a common grief, as one after another they passed slowly by the grave to take a last look at that coffin which contained the mortal remains of him whom they had loved so well. And those who had a right to speak, say that there has not been such a funeral in this country since that of Washington. Certainly, no Bishop has ever died in our branch of the Church, whose death has called forth so many tokens of sorrow from every Diocese in the land. One who was present at the Holy Communion in St. Mary's Church, the next day, the octave of Easter, says: "He who has ever participated in this most comfortable Sacrament by the death-bed of some dear friend, the idol of a stricken family, has witnessed on a small scale what was on this memora-

ble Lord's day exhibited at large among the Church people of Burlington."* To this day, his grave is covered with a mound of flowers, kept fresh by the continual offerings of loving hearts; and they who have often been in Burlington since the funeral, say they have never passed the grave, that they have not seen at least one silent mourner, uncovered, standing there to weep. And almost every mail brings us, from Bishops, and Conventions, and Convocations of the Clergy in all quarters, fresh tokens of sorrow for his death, and testimony to the estimation in which he was held.

We close our Article with the testimony of the Bishop of Indiana, which came to hand after the preceding had been written. Addressing his last Convention he said :

"He was nearly my contemporary in the ministry, and my beloved and valued friend of forty years. Our intercourse for a time was almost daily. I knew him well and intimately. He had his faults—and who has not?—great faults, as some even of his friends thought and lamented; but they were faults of natural ardent temperament, faults of manner, faults growing out of the depth and strength of his convictions, combined with an iron will and resolute determination in following out those convictions, and the exalted sense he entertained of official position, duty, and responsibility. They were, however, thrown into the shade, and more than compensated by his generous impulses, his affectionate disposition, his brilliant domestic, social, and Christian virtues. I take a melancholy pleasure in bearing this public testimony to his noble, unselfish, self-sacrificing spirit, his warm and loving heart, his burning zeal and untiring labors in the cause of God and His Church, and in every enterprise promising in any, even in the smallest way, to promote her weal and extend her influence. His superior talents, his richly cultivated mind, his brilliant genius, his profound and diversified learning, commanded my admiration. His moral worth, his deep and ardent piety, and his genial social virtues, won my high esteem and strong affection. His work for God's Church, particularly in the cause of Christian education, was wise in conception, extensive in character, and eminent in success. No man of his day has done so much for the religious training of the children of the Church, and done it so well. His Episcopate of twenty-seven years was equally distinguished for its signal efficiency, and its glorious results. Amid much misapprehension of the purity of

* "Burlington, where so much of his life of action and suffering was passed, (says Dr. Ogilby,) pronounced its judgment over the grave of Bishop Doane. The Church and the world will accept this verdict, founded on the best of testimony, that of neighbors and friends, those by whose hearth-stones he has lived and died. That dear lady, Mrs. Bradford, who loved the Bishop as her true nature loved every worthy object, said to one of the Bishops once assembled in Burlington, 'Pray, Sir, tell me, for I am but a plain woman, and have little understanding of such questions, how is it that you Bishops and Clergy from a distance, can know more of our Bishop than we know, who see him every day, at whose doors he has lived so long?' This is the question of common sense, of simple honesty. And eternal truth and right can give to this question but one answer. On that answer, we would rest the Bishop's earthly fame. The judgment pronounced by Burlington over her loved and honored Bishop's grave, might stand against the verdict of the world!"

his motives, the honesty of his purposes, and the wisdom of his plans, by some even who were apparently personally friendly, and constant and cruel misrepresentation, malicious opposition and unmerited reproach from others, who, taking counsel of their passions and prejudices, were pertinacious in their machinations and denunciations, he, strong in the *mens conscia recti*, and in the faith and fear of God his Saviour, fearlessly pursued the great work conceived by his great heart, and planned by his sagacious wisdom, unmoved by pragmatical opposition, and undaunted by reproach and calumny. What his zealous and far-seeing spirit prompted, his judgment approved, and his conscience commended as duty, that he did, and persisted in doing, regardless of personal consequences. 'Right onward,' was his principle and practice. He lived an honest man, with no deceit in his tongue, no reservation of his convictions, no double-dealing, and no mean subterfuges in his conduct. He lived a true man, true to his noble instincts, true to the high and holy principles which prompted his acts and concentrated his energies, true to his official responsibilities, true to the Church which he loved, true to his God. He lived a devoted Christian man, an affectionate, sympathizing, faithful Shepherd of the flock committed, in the Providence of God, to his chief pastoral supervision, and which, under his laborious, acceptable, and efficient ministrations, had grown from comparative feebleness to extraordinary strength, 'the little one' he found, having under his assiduous nurture 'become a thousand.' He died as he had lived. The summons to depart was sudden, but it found him with his armor on, the Christian soldier clothed in the panoply of God, and ready for the final conflict, as he had ever been for the many and grievous conflicts which seemed to cluster about his course from earliest manhood until the day of his death. His last words were a truthful and impressive epitome of the faith in which he had lived; they embodied the principles which had ever actuated his proceedings, and sustained him amid his many trials and accumulated sorrows. * * * Thus he 'fell asleep in Jesus;' for 'so He giveth His beloved sleep.'"

ART. VII.—THE PLAIN COMMENTARY.

A Plain Commentary on the Four Holy Gospels. Philadelphia: H. Hooker. 2 vols. 8vo. 1859. pp. 938.

THIS Commentary is different, in its entire style, method, and tone, from any modern work which has been written on the Gospels—certainly from any that has been written since Quesnel's Reflections. In what, then, does this remarkable difference consist? Does it consist in the fact that other Commentaries are doctrinal, whereas the Plain Commentary is devotional? This does, in part, express the difference, but without qualifications, only to a very imperfect degree, for on some doctrines, as, for example, on the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Person of our Lord, the Plain Commentary is infinitely fuller and better than any and all of the others. If, however, by this difference is meant that other Commentaries on the Gospels (we are speaking of the best) are mainly occupied with doctrinal inferences which more properly belong to a work on the Epistles, while the Plain Commentary is mainly occupied in considering the meanings of the identical words and facts recorded,—in a word, that the one is occupied chiefly with doctrinal conclusions, the other with the Person of our Lord,—then much has been said, but much which needs qualification still.

For one mind, truly religious in its way, will handle the recorded facts of our Saviour's life after a very different manner from that in which another mind, truly religious in its way, will delay upon them. We remember to have heard an Easter Sermon, evidently *intended* to be constructed upon the true Ecclesiastical theory of the Homily, which, from the minute precision with which it manipulated the facts of the record, became painful "even as an operation,"—and yet we have read Homilies, in which the same incidents were dwelt upon with equal minuteness, and only to edification. He, who remembers that the Lord Jesus is the Son of God, may safely enter upon the holy ground of His "smallest" human acts; he who does not so remember, he who has not had it laid to his heart as no power on earth except the Church hath commission to lay it, that "God and Man is one Christ" in the unity of the Person of the Lord, is always in danger of losing his

reverence when he enters upon that holy ground. Not rightly or reverently will he think of the movements of the Lord Jesus, who neglects to remember that every motion of the Son of Man is the motion of the Son of God. If the primary fact, that the Word was made Flesh, be the great Mystery of Godliness, then every recorded act and bodily movement of the Saviour is a substantive part of the Revelation of that mystery. It surely were not necessary that the Son of Man should pass from place to place by walking,—the fact then that He, being the Son of God, did so pass in space during the period of His mortal sojourn, is a fact having simply an infinitely profounder significance than if it had been written, it might be of John the Baptist, that he passed through the wilderness after the manner of a spirit. The view of the Incarnate Word, walking, speaking, motioning with His Hand, is assuredly a view which is given by the inspired Gospels,—we mean, such is the form of the inspired record, and this record is assuredly its own justification. We are no more at liberty to neglect to notice the smallest act of our Lord, than we are to neglect to notice the smallest word. In the case of the merely human subjects of Inspiration, their common human acts may be of comparatively small importance—we know them to be men, and take for granted that they act accordingly; but in the case of that Man, Who was the Son of God, His every act and deed are a veritable part of the Mystery of Godliness: to say of any of these, in any disparaging sense, that they are small, is to use language, the implication of which can be little thought of by those who venture on it.

But we are too speedily anticipating the main body of our subject. It had been our intention, in these introductory remarks, to have exhausted a list of negatives, and in the process to have eliminated most of the attributes in which the Plain Commentary is *unlike* the Modern generally. After remarking that "*rationalistic*" was *not* in our list, for the reason that we wished purposely to keep out of comparison works so painfully distinguished in this respect as most of the later specimens of Biblical Interpretation are, and because the class of Commentaries we had in mind in running the contrast,—the so-called "*Evangelical*,"—are *not* to be included, without constant qualification, under this wretched term of rationalistic—we will pass over the several negative attributes set down in our list, and take up the two positive affirmations which we find at the bottom of it.

The words *Patristic*, and *Profound*, will give us, we think, the positive discrimination, whereby the Plain Commentary

shall be found essentially to differ from the general body of Modern Interpretation. The like characteristics will appear, of course, in the expository and devotional writings of such men as Andrews and Herbert, and of our earlier writers generally who really appreciated the Fathers, but, for the same reason that the modern habit produces no devotional forms constructed upon the particulars of our Lord's Life and Person, Modern Comment has lost the power of habitual edification in the same line. Prayer now constructs its petitions upon certain scholastic (particular) *doctrines*, such as Justification, the New Birth, experience of grace, &c. Ancient prayer constructed its petitions upon Christ, that it might *know Him*, the power of His Resurrection, the Fellowship of His Sufferings. Had it fallen to the modern habit to make the Litany, (the mere supposition is startling,) the petitions commencing "By the mystery of thy holy Incarnation," would never have been thought of. The ancient devotional Offices are marked by a spiritual articulation making them to differ, in their way, from the elaborate abstraction which characterizes the modern, even as the channeled shaft in Gothic cutting differs from the pragmatic tameness of the pilastered Italian pier. And so, remote, as we fear, our illustration may seem, the entire Patristic style and method, the whole Body of their writings, differs from the modern. As the Gothic builders took the cue of nature, and followed her leadings, and produced a Style at once mystically glorious and articulately real, so the Fathers, with a like child-like faith, bent over the very words of Inspiration, followed where they lead, traced them where they marked, believed whatever resulted from their collation, and produced a Body of Comment which—to pursue the illustration—bears a like relation to the Scriptures that the Cathedral bears to Nature—it is its counterpart. Now this cannot be said of the Modern Commentaries. The best that can be said of them is that they may be the counterpart to a given portion of the subject-passage; we know of none that professes to take up each word of Inspiration and follow out its meaning in the way of Scriptural collation, as does the Plain Commentary. But this is precisely the method of the Fathers. They believed the words of Scripture to be the words of God, and they believed all that is implied when it is said of each and every word, 'that it is a word of God,' and they labored with reverent assiduity to ascertain the full meaning, in each instance, according to its Scriptural usage, *not* according to the demands of a foregone dogmatic conclusion,—not according to a habit which

places a mental process where Inspiration has placed a perpetual reality. When, for example, our Lord spoke of water to Nicodemus, the Fathers believed that water was meant,—what was further meant by water they ascertained by a careful study of the inspired symbolism. They never built up a spiritual interpretation by means of a process which destroys the letter, as is with such painful frequency the modern usage in building up a doctrinal interpretation. We venture to say, that no case of Patristic comment can be produced, even from Origen himself, in which the letter of Scripture has received such treatment as the Third and Sixth chapters of St. John have received at the hands of Modern Commentators. That the Patristic method has resulted in *mystical* interpretations, follows of course; such is the inspired method itself. There are very few quotations in the New Testament from the Old, which do not acquire their force from this fact. But if by *mystical* is meant unreal and vague, then we hold the term to be far more deservingly applied to the productions of the Modern School. In themselves they—the Modern Commentaries—may be straight-forward and four-square as a piece of Dutch gardening; but in the attempt to make them connect fully and exhaustively with the Scriptures commented upon, they will be found vague to the last degree, vague with the kind of vagueness which characterizes everything which is so extremely artificial. It is in fact the indefatigable reality of the Patristic Comment, which, more than anything else, confounds our present mental habits. We will venture to make the same remark as it respects the Holy Scriptures. It is easy enough, for example, to spiritualize the account of the temptation in Paradise, at the expense of the letter, in the same way that *water* is interpreted to be *spirit* in the Third of St. John and then dropt out as if the word were not there,—it is the literal fact which most confounds the prevailing method. It is easy to say of the incident narrated in St. John ix, 6, that it is symbolical of this or that; but to construct a spiritual comment of which the fact itself shall form the perpetual and substantial ground, is not an easy task. The modern method of spiritualizing the articulate realities of mystical Scriptures is of a piece—to revert again to our Architectural illustration—with the “Revived-Classic” way of idealizing the mystic precision of the Gothic groining into the smooth impertinence of the Roman ceiling! It is indeed wonderful to see with what ease the modern comment is able to ignore the outstanding facts of inspired Writ. Wonderful, that is, when we consider Whose words are the subject of comment—when considered

on mere metaphysical ground, independent of the sanctions which we should suppose would operate to restrain it, and which not so operating, the modern comment is growing more and more *irreligious*—the phenomenon ceases to be wonderful. It is part and parcel of the universal sway of a scientific method. The spirit which is so analyzing the world and all things, that the concrete reality everywhere has come to stand to our minds as the mere result of the operation of laws, instead of being the pure creations which they are,—even the same spirit has entered the domain of Scripture, and hewed the living trees of Inspiration into timbers.

It is no part of our intention to cast unqualified disparagement upon the works of Modern Commentators. The pious labors of Henry and Scott in this line, are still most useful—more so than most that have followed them. Nor do we deny all utility to the modern school, strictly so called, and which has taken its growth from the German Exegesis. It is confessedly of the utmost importance that we should know we have the text of Holy Scripture, and that we should be acquainted with the power of every word of the same, *so far as Science can help us*,—which we take to be the sum and substance of what German scholars have been doing in the matter. As it respects the temper of mind in which they—the best of them—have sat over their work, may we be saved from it! It is only pernicious. It will communicate itself to minds otherwise reverent of Holy Writ. We have never known a single instance of a Biblical scholar having to any extent devoted himself to the study of their labors, who has wholly escaped the contagion of their irreverent spirit. Neander, Olshausen, and Tholuck, we take to be the best of the German Commentators, but if we are to attain to the benefit of their labors only at the expense of losing our dread of their irreverence, then it is our hope that we may remain in happy ignorance of that benefit. But now, both as it respects the strictly Modern Exegetical School, and the less Modern “Evangelical” Expository Schools of Biblical Interpretation, we feel compelled to say of the whole of them, that, on the score of a profound and fruitful comprehension of the Inspired Word, they are well nigh infinitely behind the Fathers. We do not, as we have said, put down the labors of the Modern Commentators at nothing; we cannot believe that any one generation has been without some useful cotemporary helps for the understanding of Holy Scripture, and we may hope that the toils even of infidel Lexicographers shall be made in some way to contribute good service—we would thankfully admit the por-

tion of good in all—but we must maintain that in comparison with what the Patristic Commentators attained to, the whole body of the modern is but a portion—a fragmentary and superficial portion. The richest Comment of the Evangelical School has never found Christ in the Canticles as Theodoret has—all that has been written on St. John is fractional and superficial indeed, when compared with St. Augustine. What the modern way of Interpretation is to *result* in, we cannot tell,—we hope for the best; but that it shall result in much, except as it goes back to the Patristic *method* of handling Scripture, we can never believe. If we are not at present in a transitional condition which is to be perfected by a reverting to this method, then we are prepared to say, “let the Modern Comment go, let it pass away for nought, let us have the Fathers and nothing but the Fathers.” Perhaps Owen on Hebrews, and Tholuck on St. John, are, on the whole, the most classical specimens of the post-Patristic school—we would be willing to test the whole question as to the comparative merits of the Ancient and Modern Comment, by placing St. Chrysostom along side the one, and St. Augustine along side the other. Or, we would be willing to test the question thus—take *any* Commentator who has written for the last two hundred years, and *he* will be found invariably the most instructive and the most profound, who is most familiar with the writings of the Fathers. Daillé on Colossians is altogether the richest piece of Comment which we have found among the Continental Reformed—its richness is due to its familiarity with Patristic exposition, a richness which Daillé’s polemical attitude to the Fathers on other grounds, and which the hardening dogmatism of his theology could not wholly exclude. A man cannot range in *these* gardens without bringing away something of their fragrance and fruitage—a man may range, or tramp rather, over the beaten ground and amid the shingle glare of much modern comment, and bring away little but dryness in his spirit. What he *does* gather of “prosperous fruit” will generally be some waif from the Patristic field.

Or, yet again, we will offer one more test; let the devout man, and the man that is seeking to become more and more devout—let this man, whose devotional food among uninspired writers has been drawn from any of those commonly called evangelical—let him become familiar with the Meditations of Augustine, or the Imitation of a-Kempis—and we venture to say that in every case the thought of going back to his old favorites will be a thought as of dryness, dissatisfaction, and painfulness. And now we will go on to

say, that for the same reason the same result will follow the familiar (uncritical) use of the Plain Commentary. If the reader's hand-book on the Gospels heretofore has been among some of the later works, he will throw the volume from his hands and remove it from his house; if it has been in Scott, he will retain his Scott for occasional reference; but he will make the Plain Commentary his *vade mecum*; he will find the wonderful things of the Law set forth in a way he never saw before; he will find words, incidents, and events, surcharged with meanings, which he had passed over as common things; he will find his attention drawn to the most edifying meditation of divine mysteries; he will find Christ everywhere.

It may seem hard if we shall say that the Plain Commentary differs from the modern generally, in that it is full of Christ; but such is nevertheless the fact. The best that can be said of the best of Modern Comment is, that it is full of the doctrine of salvation. The Gospels, according to the will of the Spirit, are full of Christ; of the Epistles, it may be said, that they are full of the doctrine of Christ. The Gospels never leave us without the presence of the Lord; it is of Him that they speak from beginning to end, and speak in such a way as to keep the Person of our Redeemer in constant view. The Epistles may for a moment leave the Lord's Person, if we may so speak, in order to discourse of His work and the effects of it. But only for a short mental moment do even the Epistles thus hold the doctrine of Atonement apart from the Person of the Saviour. It is true that the Apostle to the Gentiles does, in one of his Epistles, stop to argue the question of Justification, but he argues in such a way as to show us that this, as well as every other doctrine, is nothing apart from His Body, Whom God raised up. Whatever of argumentation is done by inspired writers, upon the work of Atonement, is so done as to *unite* that work with the Flesh of the Word, never so done as to divide them. While, therefore, it is an obvious and allowable distinction to say that the Gospels give us the History of the Lord, and the Epistles give us the doctrines of salvation; yet it must ever be borne in mind that no inspired writing gives any doctrine of salvation apart from the Person of Christ; that the substance of the Gospels is the substance of the Epistles; that the beginning, middle, and end of the one is that of the other; Jesus Christ, of the Seed of David, the Son of God, crucified for our sins, raised for our Justification; God manifest in the

Flesh, made manifest by the Church in the Saints. In accrediting, then, to the Modern Comment a fullness of the doctrine of salvation, we must not be understood to admit that it has this fullness in a way analogous to the inspired Epistles. It has it somewhat as the early chapters of the Epistle to the Romans would have it, had the doctrine of the Resurrection and of Baptism been left out. *The Modern Comment has separated the doctrine of the Atonement from the Person of the Lord.* Of this, there can be no more certain evidence than the fact that we find so many of its readers who can speak much of Christ, and yet have little abiding impression of the Flesh of the Son of Man. We narrate a simple fact, when we declare that we were once put to it and found it no easy labor to help an aged believer, who had been living upon the "doctrine of Justification," to realize her Christian hope as existing in that Body which Thomas handled.

The doctrine of salvation is tied to the person of Christ, in the Epistles, by means of the doctrine of the Church and Sacraments. We are Justified by the Faith of Him, into Whom we are Baptized. Now, it is forever impossible for the critical method—and such is the method of all un-Patristic comment—to hold fast to this use of the Church and Sacraments. Nay, it is impossible for the critical mind to hold fast to the meaning of a New Testament symbol. How can anything short of Faith manage with such sayings as, "I am the Vine, ye are the Branches." "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of one of these, ye have done it unto Me?" *The Church, Christ's Body; Do This in remembrance of Me; Baptized into His Death, Burial, and Resurrection;* these are the very instruments of the true comment, but these are the very instruments which the critical comment cannot possibly manage. It is possible to conceive such a commentator being doctrinally orthodox on the separate questions; it is *not* possible to conceive of his doing otherwise than laying each separate doctrine carefully away in a box by itself. Nothing short of a spirit of implicit faith in the words of inspired Scripture can understand that every *verbum Dei* of Holy Writ, is *verbum Deus* of the Holy Gospel; and such alone is competent to make a comment which shall be to any adequate degree a counterpart of that concerning which it undertakes to speak.

Take a single phase of this vast subject—that of the fact of our Lord's Resurrection. Now, what modern comment makes any such use of this Fact as the inspired writers of

the Epistles made? What substantive, ever-present place, for example, has the fact of Christ's risen Body, in the scheme, as now held, of Justification by Faith, or of the emotional sense of the experience of Grace? Have we not heard thousands of sermons on justification and the new birth, that gave the hearer no bodily Christ—that left him with an abstract of the doctrine of salvation? And is it not to this abstract that but too often the name of Christ is given? The one word of invitation to sinful men, by the Gospel, is, "Come unto Me and be saved." Now, if any man think he can discuss the doctrine of the atoning work of Christ, and make it clear for men, otherwise than by discussing the same in connection with the very Person of Christ, let him know that he is undertaking that which was not undertaken by inspired writers, and that he is assuredly dividing what God has joined. Such doctrine *must* trouble men's souls. Whoso leaves a man with a doctrine of salvation which is not the doctrine of Christ's Person, assuredly he leaves the man in a dry spot. And this is what the Plain Commentary does not do, but does its opposite to a wonderfully successful degree. It strikes us with constant wonder that *any* modern mind has been able so generally to attain to the Patristic method. We would far rather put this volume into the hands of a person anxiously inquiring after the way of salvation, than any volume of sermons or manual of directions we have seen. And for the same reason we should rejoice to see it in the hands of every one who is in any way called to give religious teaching—parents, pastors, and trainers of Sunday School classes.

The other kind of teaching, doctrinal teaching, so called—doctrinal teaching done in any other way than that which the Plain Commentary follows—is always exposed to the danger of leaving the individual with a mere mental abstract of the truth; with a formula, instead of the reality. However useful doctrinal formulas may be in Theology, they are of little use in holy living. It is assuredly of use to know that we are Justified by Faith; it is of no use to know the doctrine, if we hold it apart from Him into Whom we are baptized. Each and every doctrine of salvation possesses substantive truth only in Christ—the doctrine, or the preaching, or the thinking of it, which does not draw the individual to Him, is an empty beating of the air. "O that I might get near Him, that I might touch but the hem of His garment, that He would give me that living water, that He would give me His Flesh to eat;" these are the demands of

the universal heart of man in his time of need; and these are demands which no mere doctrine of salvation can ever satisfy. It is the "mystical man," namely, the spiritual, which makes these demands; and the mystical man is that very man which perishes, if it have not reality and fact given to it. Of this word, *mystical*, we shall attempt no further definition than merely to say that it always and invariably has its foundation in that which is most express, actual and real; and that it is always destroyed by substituting a thought in the place of that foundation. Now, there is a system of religious teaching, the immediate object of which is to set forth union with Christ—and there is a system, the immediate object of which is to set forth union with the doctrine and experience, so called, of salvation. The one system makes constant use of the personal History of the Lord, and of His personal representatives, such as the Church, the Sacraments, His presence in the saints, in the poor, in the maimed, in little children. The *doctrines* with which this system operates, will be the doctrines of the Creed; which doctrines are remarkable in this respect, that they cannot be dealt with apart from the Person of the Redeemer. The other system makes little real use of the personal history of the Saviour; scarcely any of the doctrine of His Person. It rather esteems such kind of teaching to be unprofitable, possibly unspiritual. It would judge it more salutary, for example, to preach a course of sermons on the Attributes, abstractly considered, than to show forth the character of the Godhead as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ. It prefers thinking about "experiences," to meditating on Christ. It is more at home with the clouds of Sinai than with the Child in Bethlehem. It takes more naturally to the Sabbath than to the Day of the Son. The fact that the air we live in has felt the movements of the Incarnate Word, has no reality for it. It prefers to go back of the "Word made Flesh," and to pass by the "Word made Flesh," as if there were anything which has been made known to us of God, out of Christ. Of course this system makes little use of the Church as Christ's Body, or of the Sacraments, or of the poor, or of sufferers, or of children, or of the things of the natural world and of Providence, as His bodily and personal representatives. Indeed, it has no conception of the Symbol, "The Church Christ's Body," other than as a figure of speech! This, too, the system which complains of the figurative comments of the Fathers! Now, we say that the system which thus sets forth the doctrine of Christ, must, in the nature of things, often impart the figure of the doctrine without imparting any substantial Symbol of the

reality; in a word, must leave the individual with a subjective notion, to which he gives the name of One Who is the Son of God. We have no difficulty in saying that such is a most unwholesome system of teaching. If any man think he have warrant for it in the doctrinal teachings of the Epistles, let him see if he can find an Epistle without the Church, the Sacraments, the presence of Christ in the Saints, and in the world; let him consider that solemn charge of the Apostle, especially claimed to be doctrinal, "*Remember that Jesus Christ, of the seed of David, was raised from the dead according to my Gospel.*" The Plain Commentary throughout proceeds upon the principle that the doctrines of salvation are to be promulgated as growing out of Christ; in no sense out of human thought. It simply follows the lead of the Gospels on which it is commenting. And if at any time carried beyond its direct guidance, it is careful to proceed in an equal line of direction. When it ceases to represent the Lord in immediate connection with His personal history, it goes on to do so in the way directed at the close of the Gospels. Neither of these methods can the other system adhere to. The personal acts of the Lord stand rather in its way; its thought cannot comprehend them, its mind cannot dwell upon them, it is so accustomed to ideas that *things* are an obstacle to it, it is so used to figures that forms and deeds have little reality for it; much less, then, can it take its stand, in teaching, along side the Sacramental representatives of the Ascended Saviour. Not having learned to be at home throughout the Gospel History, it cannot be expected to find itself at home at its end. He who has not found the Lord in all which He has done, will not be likely to "make disciples" in all the way which He has commanded.

But more than this, and back of this—the modern system, (we continue to call it so merely for convenience, meaning, of course, the non-Patristic,) this Puritan system, which has effected the separation, of which we have been speaking, between the doctrine of salvation and the very Person of the Word, has made a deeper separation in the Lord's Person. It is no part of our intention to do more than refer again to this mysterious subject. But we feel that it is at this point more than any other that the modern way of dealing with the records of Inspiration, and especially with the Gospel History, comes short. There are many things which the critical mind can hold together: the two Natures of our Lord in one Divine Person, is what it cannot hold together. The critical mind, and by the critical mind we mean that which places its own

reasonings and figures where the words and the forms of Holy Writ alone have place and residence; this critical mind, this abstract doctrinal faculty, can never frame its speech rightly in speaking of the Incarnate Word and Wisdom of God. It ever speaks as if there were two Persons—as if the Son of Man were a separate Being from the Son of God. The modern view could by no conceivable possibility have framed the Athanasian Creed.

If for no other reason than that we might learn to think and speak rightly of the Divine Wisdom, would we rejoice to know that a copy of the Plain Commentary were in every Christian family. We know of no single book, certainly of no Commentary, which would promise so much. It is, by the way, a point very plainly to be noticed, that the right phraseology, as it respects the proper view of our Lord's Person, has been preserved by Church writers only. We do not mean to say, that Continental and Denominational Theology has entirely lost the true doctrine; we do mean to say, that neither in thought or speech is it familiar with the truth; nor are we able to see how this should be expected. We have already made the remark, that to the Church has been committed the keeping of the mystery. Blot out the Church, and assuredly there remains no Body on earth to say that God is Three in the Unity of One, and that God the Word, and Jesus the Lord, are One Christ. And if there were any other Body to say it, it would say it in vain, because human reason is not competent to say it otherwise than in vain.

There is no fuller test of the modern lack of a right familiarity with the orthodox Faith at the most serious point under consideration, than the almost utter incompetency of Modern Comment, in dealing with the narrative of our Saviour's life. It seems able to perceive readily the Divine Person, only in Its miraculous acts. The Saviour walking on the water, astounds it into adoration; Jesus walking on the land, excites no adoring wonder; it can only be because it sees in that Jesus some other than the Person of the Word of God! Whereas, if it looked rightly upon the One Lord, Son of David and Son of God, it could never forget that His acts are all Divine, all miraculous, and all infinitely significant. The right view sees the Son of God, our Lord and God, as readily seated at the well of Sychar, or standing by the grave of Lazarus in the hands of men,—as on the Mount of Transfiguration. Indeed, with a certain profounder readiness, inasmuch as it is more wonderful that God should be seen and handled, than that Christ should take on His own glory.

It is not, however, with the ordinary human acts of our Lord that the critical method owns itself at fault, it is able to make no more account of them than if they were the acts of a human person; nor is it with those acts which are more manifestly Divine, for these readily excite its wondering adoration. The class of incidents in the Life of our Lord, which reveals as by a touchstone this most serious incompetency of modern Interpretation, are those confessedly *mystical*; such as His action in curing the blind and the dumb with earth and spittle, in suffering virtue to pass through His garment, in taking Bread after His Resurrection. Of these acts, the most the Critical System can say, is that they are "symbolical;" and *symbolical*, on *its* lips, means—the shadow of a shadow—means simply *nothing*. The acknowledged mystical acts of our Lord the modern Comment can make nothing of, except by a process which evaporates the fact in which alone the mystery consists. And how should it be otherwise? Has it not done the same with the Sacrament, which is the very instrument of the mystical vision of Inspired Words? Has it not—we must ask it—has it not done the like with the very Body? Is it any wonder, then, that it should fail to recognize in the Human the ever Divine, and in the mystical the truly natural? It owns the Word, it sees the Flesh; the Word made Flesh it does not always see. It fears to worship Jesus in the tomb. It cannot remember that the Word made Flesh is the substance of the Revelation of God. It does not see that Word *in* the word; the word of inspiration, the word of creation, or the word of Providence. It is not aware of Christ as at the head of the whole Creature, does not behold Him in the Church, does not perceive Him by the Angels. How, then, should it not be put to confusion when it hears that from out His own Flesh He breathed on them the Holy Ghost, or when Thomas thrusting his hand into that Flesh was constrained to say, "My Lord and my God."

When the Word was made Flesh He took and made part of His Divine Person the dust of the ground. This earth is *not* the same that it was before the feet of the Son of Man trod upon it. This air is not the same that it was before the Son of God breathed it. This water is not the same it was before the Lord drank of it, and was baptized in it. This bread is not the same it was before the Lord ate of it, and took it into His hands and blessed and multiplied it. It is *something* that God the Son hath taken into Himself the creature which He made. *What* that something is, we cannot tell; but we know that it *is*, for there is

no profounder reality and truth than the Body of the Lord Jesus. If *this* be not so, if *He* rose not from the dead, then are we of all creatures most miserable. Such acts, therefore, as our Lord's healing, raising the dead, multiplying bread by the touch of His Hand; acts which must be symbolized into emptiness and made as if they were not by the critical mind, are those which are the very household Symbols of the Faith of His Divine Person. Every act, proper to the Human Nature of our Lord, was at the same time the Act and Deed of the Divine Person of the Word. If no word of God has ever been in vain, so no act of Christ was ever in vain. The movement of the Hand of Christ is the movement of that Being by Whom the worlds were made, in Whom all things subsist, and by Whom all things are reconciled unto God. It is forever impossible to acknowledge this, except by the Faith which acknowledges our God and Redeemer one Christ. That Faith, which is the Truth as *it is* in Jesus, sees equally in His natural and in His "supernatural" acts, one Redeemer, one Lord.

The entire Gospel History, and every iota of the same, is, to Faith, the History of EMMANUEL. It believes that in that History every word of God is real and true. It believes that when the Body of the Lord came into the world the Son of the Highest came. If it has been anxious to let no word of Jehovah, when the ministry was that of Angels, escape its reverent heed, it will be careful most surely that it shall lose no word of Him Who is the "Builder of this House." Every act, and deed, and incident of Christ, is such a word. It cannot sit when Jesus speaks, it cannot stand when Jesus walks, it will not sleep when Jesus kneels. It will think, and yearn, and meditate, over everything that is said of Him, as of a thing the most veritable, real, and true, of all the things it can bring into connection with its own being. To its view the whole period and enclosure of the Gospel History, every event, every incident, every movement, of the narrative—the air, the ground, the fields, the streets, of these and all, it is *something* that the God of Heaven came into personal contact with them through the Body of His Flesh. And such is, in reality, the virtual belief of the Christian world. Every Christian heart feels that Jacob did a natural thing in raising a monument on the ground made holy even by the vision of the Son of Man. The holy places of the Holy Land still attract the heart of Christendom. The stoutest Puritan that ever lived, if he really believed that Jesus of Nazareth was his Lord and God, would fall down before the authentic

mark of the footprint of his Saviour—would have the same feeling in view of the marks of the tracings of His finger on the ground, which he would have in view of the identical Tables written in the Mount. The air, the water, the ground, the winds and skies, the streets and cities, the houses and the tombs, and the whole era of the Gospel Histories, are, to the earnest and longing vision of Faith, filled with such tracings, even with the marks of the progress of the Son of God from Bethlehem to Olivet, in the work of man's salvation; and every such tracing is of the very Body, the very Hand, the very Breath, of God the Lord.

Is not the Gospel Record in some veritable way a counterpart of the Lord Himself? And is it possible that a Book, written on the "manly and sensible" scheme demanded by the age, could answer the religious needs of nineteen centuries of men, possibly to some extent of angels, and of the centuries yet to come? If a mere human book becomes universal in the proportion it is mystical, as all books containing true poetry are, must not every word of the Bible possess a mystical power? If the Word of Inspiration had been uttered from the Throne of God immediately, should we judge that any one of the words so spoken were merely a common word? How then any the more common, because given through the ministry of Angels and men? How any more common, because brought by the Word Himself? And because we say the words possess a mystical power, do we thereby unsettle their sense and reality? We do not, except to the mind which sees not that the breathing which conveyed the Spirit to the Apostles was the breathing with which the Saviour slept in the ship; and the mind which does not so see, makes the acts of Christ phantasmal, and much of the Inspired Word anecdotal! It must be remembered that these Fathers, who are so charged with *mystifying* the Word of Inspiration because they believed the Spirit of God in every word and incident, are the very men who cling to the Flesh and Body of Christ, in a way which the same school considers carnal! No, it was *because* they believed that the Flesh of Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost, that they believed it to be true Flesh; and it was because they believed the Words of Inspiration filled with the same Spirit, that they believed them to be real and living words. The modern world does not, as it seems to us, approach towards having the unconquerable sense of the divine reality of either the Word of Inspiration, or of the Flesh of the Word, which was patent to the Fathers.

We say, that the modern process obliterates the letter, sub-

stituting its own mental conclusions. The Patristic method finds the solution of the mystery *in* the letter, and ties it to the letter; in a word, the Patristic comment on the Word of Inspiration is precisely of the same nature with its comment on the Person of the Word. It separates not the doctrine of salvation from the Body of the Lord, it divides not the Person of the Word from the Flesh of the Son of Man. To them it was the very Words of Inspiration, which were Spirit and Life; it was *not* the human, mental conclusions concerning these words. The Fathers believed that the pronounciation of the Inspired Word had power; the modern spirit, where truly Christian, believes the same, and *gives* the Word to the sick when their minds are at the weakest, and to the insane and insensible, who seem to have no mind at all; but it goes directly in the face of its own theory, in so doing. If the Word of Inspiration is not a mystical Word, then it can be of no service to the man whose mind is not at the point of "manly thinking." Thanks be to God, that the heart of man need not in all things follow his head; blessed be God that we all know of humble saints to whom the Words of Inspiration are a power which Dictionaries and Grammars know nothing of! Thanks be to God, that that Book of Psalms, which no mortal man has ever written of with full intelligence, not even the Fathers who have done the most and best of all, can nevertheless be learnt upon the knees. But let the modern Comment undertake to teach one how to pray the Sixty-Ninth Psalm. The most it can do is to divide and insulate the parts: "this verse is Messianic; that portion belongs to the author alone; the imprecations are prophetic; this is theanthropical, that anthropological." On the other hand, hear St. Augustine: "We that are made the Body of Christ, let us not fail to recognize our own voice in the Psalms, and other Scriptures. Christ—wheresoever in those Books, wheresoever in those Scriptures, I am journeying and panting for breath, in that sweat of our face which is part of our sentence as men—Christ is there openly or secretly to refresh me. He only, who finds no pleasure in these holy manifestations of Christ, is *turned unto fables.*" The one, in phrases the very sound of which is chilling, can but apportion the passage into parts severally distinct and conflicting, as it respects any real unity of appropriation; the other, with a language whose every word savors of the unction of the Sanctuary, encloses the whole passage, still severally divided, in the one Ark, in relation to which, the man of prayer is both actively and passively *Theophorus*. Even so and always is the modern Com-

ment *divisional* throughout, and so it must be, because it is under the guide of the intellect; at the same time, therefore, it is and must be *visionary*. The Patristic alone is constructive and properly edifying, inasmuch as it is under the guide of Faith. Union with Christ, by the Church His Body, by the Saints His members, by the Sacraments His representatives, and by Faith His gift; this gives the key to its method. It believes that every word of Scripture is a word of God, that every event and incident concerning the Saviour is an event and incident concerning Emmanuel, and with child-like faith it carries by that word and meditates upon the incident, until it feel a meaning. Now, this child-like faith in the Word of Inspiration, is that in which consists the immeasurable profundness of the Patristic Comment, and which is the manliness of the full stature of the "child of the Kingdom." The Patristic Comment has a sense and consciousness of the very and everywhere present Word, and Wisdom, and Goodness of God in Christ, the like of which is not known to the modern. It has a Body, and a Spirit, to which the excessive intellectualism of the modern is but as a Docetic vision. Not until thought and prayer shall have become far more deeply coincident than they are in the present age, may we expect the prevailing modern Comment to give us any real assistance in the Psalms, or on the Gospels.

All that we have said of the Patristic Comment, we have been saying at the same time of the *Plain Commentary*; except that the Plain Commentary is restrained by the pressure of the times from fully carrying out the Patristic method. It is, indeed, as it seems to us, rather too cautious, at certain points. We will give an example. Speaking of the miracle of the loaves, page 691, "It cannot be without an object, that St. John has thus reminded us that these were '*barley loaves.*' What may that object therefore be presumed to be? And why do all the Evangelists so often state that the loaves were *five* in number? Are we simply to see in the material of the loaves an indication of the *season* of the year: in their number, a careful distinction of the present miracle from that other occasion when *seven* loaves furnished forth a banquet for four thousand? The perfect safety of such criticism forcibly recommends it to writers and readers of every description; and very far are we from disparaging a style of remark which we believe to be in itself perfectly true, and which is doubtless highly valuable also. But the question arises, Is this the *whole* truth? May there not have been yet another object in the writer's mind for dwelling on the fact that the present

miracle was wrought with *five* loaves of *barley* bread? But we forbear to speculate. It shall suffice to have invited the reader's attention to the subject, and to have avowed our own suspicions. The reference of the present miracle to the coming Sacrifice of Christ, and to the benefits consequent thereon, is, however, something more than a mere matter of opinion."

We quote this passage as showing the Author's general carefulness in the above description of symbolism, and at the same time to enter a protest against the times, which necessitate such caution on the part of so competent a writer. Suppose that in these five loaves, or in the five perches, or in the five Books of Moses "the Prophet," or in the five stones which David drew from the water of the brook, we are reminded of our own five senses, and then of the Flesh of the Word to which we are united in our Baptism, in which we have the keeping of the Law, and conquer Satan, and have our healing, and live the life of Grace; is *this* of no utility? One certainly would not make the doctrine of the Incarnation to grow out of the number five; but in a Book which is characterized from Genesis to Revelation by mystical numbers, one is certainly at liberty to draw all possible edification from them. It is not mystification so to do, it is reverence, and the very highest good sense. Or suppose, in reading the other miracle of the loaves, the number *seven* should remind us that He Who wrought with the *five*, is One with Him by Whom the world was made? Again, we ask, have we gained nothing? Is it nothing if a *number* has brought us nearer to the truth that God and man are One Christ; that by the Flesh He gives, the world hath life; that He has overcome the Goliath who for "forty days" has been accursing our souls? The Comment which denies us this, is the Comment that sees no Spirit in the wind, finds no Christ in the water, gives no Angels to the children, and speaks with a conciliatory beseeching towards Science when it speaks of *any* miracle! We would rather be a child and believe all things, than be the grown man who can walk upon the earth once pressed by the feet of the Son of God, and have a care to diminish miracles!

But while the Plain Commentary, wisely, perhaps, for the sake of the times, abstains from a considerable portion of the field of Patristic symbolism, it does not by any means fail to find edification from those portions of the inspired Record which the critical method passes over as mere human accidents in the grammar of the narrative. One could make a very instructive volume of excerpts from the Plain Commentary on parts of the inspired Narrative, which the general method

passes over altogether. It is, indeed, this characteristic of the Book which makes it so singularly rich and edifying. And it is this which gives it its proper name of *Plain Commentary*, and which results in its being so profound. We shall but repeat ourselves in saying that it is because it bends over every word as over a word of God. It is the same quality which makes the volume so exceedingly valuable to the sick. We wish not to go into the metaphysics of the matter, but we all know that we become recipients of truth by very different mental processes;—and among these the act of *meditation* is confessedly the most fruitful kind of thinking done upon divine things. It is characteristic of this act that it is done upon *things* rather than upon inferences and conclusions. Our Saviour is not only the Teacher of the Way, He is the Way,—He is Truth, and Life, and Wisdom Itself. We shall always do well to fix our view on the *things of Christ*, on the concrete forms of divine realities, at least as much as the Gospels simply followed will lead us to do. It is not upon doctrines that we meditate, it is upon facts, incidents, looks—it is upon Christ; a single, well-remembered look of a departed friend will do more than anything else to bring him to mind. We can confidently say that the *Plain Commentary* is a Book never to be taken in hand without profit, when we are in that state of mind which longs for spiritual refreshment and cannot bear the thought of mental agitation. Scott is far too *hard* a Book for such a state of mind. Doddridge is a weariness. What, then, shall we say of the rest? The *Plain Commentary* is a blessing for the sick, for those who keep days of private fasting, and for all who desire an inexhaustible fund of Devotional reading, and are tired of the private thoughts even of the pious. We know of a Christian lady who lately died a most remarkably pious death, from whose hands the *Plain Commentary* was never absent during the period of her illness. For the space of a year she read no other book, studying it thoroughly and verifying all the references. We have, in several instances, recommended this Book to young persons when in a more than usually serious state of mind—and always with the same good effect—that of a most cordial interest in its pages, and an expression of gratified astonishment at its singular richness and suggestiveness. No Book we know of will so take the mind by the hand, so to speak, and lead one forth amidst the things of holy Inspiration. We have already compared the word of inspired Scripture to the word revealed in creation. He who takes us by the hand and points out to us the beauty of natural objects, does more for us than

the man who reads us a chapter on Aesthetics—so the Plain Commentary does more than the Modern Comment generally. Nor are we led under its guidance simply to the little rivulets and the narrow spots of the vast scene of the Gospel history—we are in the hands of a leader who follows whither *he is led*—and who, with the equal reverence and simplicity of one who knows no greater or smaller among the things of God, bends over the lily of the valley or lifts his believing vision upward from the base of the great mountains. For power of statement as to the great mysteries of godliness, and the practical bearings of the same, the Book is incomparable. If we were asked for a volume which should best tell one what may be known of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and the practical bearing of the whole subject of the Atonement, we should unhesitatingly say the Plain Commentary is the best. If we were asked what would you recommend a commencing sermonizer to do with a view of enriching his discourses, and of avoiding the prevailing complaint of emptiness and tediousness of the modern sermon, we would propose that for the space of a year the Plain Commentary, with Augustine on St. John, should be the constant study.

Let us give an instance of the writer's habit of drawing instruction from those parts of the inspired narrative which we generally pass over as having no more than a *mere* narrative force. We will quote a short paragraph from page 675, where at the end of his comment on the fiftieth verse of the fourth chapter of St. John, he says—

“It seems worth pointing out that as our Saviour abode for ‘two days’ at Sychar, and then restored the young man, so also when He heard that Lazarus was sick ‘He abode two days in the same place where he was,’ and then announced His intention of going to ‘awake him out of sleep.’ Were not these acts typical of His own Resurrection ‘on the third day?’ according to that of the Prophet,—‘After two days will He revive us; in the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live in His sight.’

Again, we ask, is there nothing edifying in this—is there no gain here as compared with the method which finds no remembrancer of Christ in the incidents mentioned? ‘But it adds nothing to the sum of my knowledge of Christ.’ Nay, but it does. It may not add anything which one could write down precisely, nevertheless it adds to the sum of your knowledge of Christ, whenever you make one more thing, experience, or want, to remind you of Him. When you awake from sleep and are reminded that of Christ it was said, “I laid me down and slept, I awoke, for the Lord sustained me,” when you see a little child eating bread and are reminded that Christ ate bread—you have increase to the sum of your knowledge of Christ.

Again: test the the Modern and the Patristic Comment in the following passage.

"They bring unto Him one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech; and they beseech Him to put His hand upon him. And He took him aside from the multitude, and put His fingers into his ears, and He spit, and touched his tongue; and looking up to Heaven, He sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened."*

The Patristic method of dealing with a passage such as this, in which every word is mystical and every word *was done*, is simply this—it believes the Incarnation to be a reality, namely, that the Word, or God, the Second Person of the adorable Trinity, was made flesh, so as that God the Son and the Human Nature of Christ are One Lord in the Divine Person of the Saviour. It believes, therefore, the hand, the finger, the mouth, the spittle, the eyes, the sigh, and every particular part of the action, to be the very property and deed of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. So believing, and so *having learned* to believe, the passage became full to overflowing with Christ—the Messiah of whom the Law and the Prophets spoke—it was to them what the account of the giving of the law is to us, but *with the Incarnation added!* The Modern "Evangelical" Comment can make nothing of the passage, because it is too rationalistic to realize the terms in which it is given, and it is too reverent of the Lord Jesus to make them mythical. It can do nothing but pass them by! And yet not thus can it stultify itself at *every* point—let us again give thanks that it can *pray* these mystic words. It can on that ground cry to the Lord Jesus to stretch forth His right hand—to touch the burdened heart—to lay His finger on the stammering tongue and lip—to breathe upon the fainting spirit—to shed down the perpetual dew of His grace. Let us see, then, if the Plain Commentary has been able to extract edifying matter from these divine words. Alas, that it has to be so cautious—alas, that in the Psalms and Canticles the features of our Lord should have come to shine so dimly, that, having arrived at the reality in the Person and Members of Him in Whom we live and move, we should be so blind to the glory, and so dead to the sweetness of the Flesh that giveth us our life—nay, that the fragrance of His mouth should have become a cause of offense!

"Wherefore did He proceed so to deal with him? Since bodily ailment is the constant type of spiritual infirmity, consider whether it may not have been implied by this act of our Lord, that the deaf ears are *then* only effectually unstopped, when they have received into them—been *penetrated* as it were by—the Finger, which is only another name for *the Spirit*, of God; as was

* Plain Commentary, p. 326. St. Mark, vii, 32.

explained in the notes on St. Luke xi, 20. Consider whether our Saviour, by this act of His, may not have been doing in symbol, what He is elsewhere declared to have done in reality,—when it is said of the Eleven Apostles, ‘*Then opened He their understanding.*’ Further, by transferring the moisture of His own Divine mouth, twice to the eyes—once to the lips—of an afflicted creature, was He not satisfying, symbolically, those well-known petitions of the Psalmist,—‘*Open Thou mine eyes, that I may see the wondrous things of Thy Law;*’ ‘*Thou shalt open my lips, O Lord, and my mouth shall show Thy praise?*’ Were not those two acts an indication,—the one, that ‘*The commandment of the Lord*’ (‘*The word of His lips*’) ‘*is pure, enlightening the eyes;*’ the other, that ‘*the tongue of the stammerer is ready to speak plainly,*’ when the Redeemer hath fulfilled His covenant,—namely, that He will *put His Spirit in the mouth* of the seed of Jacob forever?*

After commenting on the incident of Our Lord’s looking up to Heaven, the writer proceeds to remark concerning that which is said “*He sighed,*”—

“This is more difficult to explain. But since, at the raising of Lazarus, our Saviour is said to have not only ‘wept,’ but also to have groaned in the Spirit, and been troubled; and since the occasion seems *then* to have been the tears of Mary and of the Jews who came with her, joined to the grief of His own human heart for Lazarus, His friend; may it not be that a feeling of compassion (excited by some unrelated circumstance) occasioned the sign of external emotion here recorded by the Evangelist? His notice of it will be felt to be the more affecting when it is coupled with St. Paul’s assertion of our Lord’s fellow-feeling with His creatures, and especially when the Origin and History of Physical Evil is considered. This last remark, indeed, suggests that the Human Sympathies of the Saviour were co-extensive with Human suffering and sorrow; and, (as it is said in another place,) that ‘His tender mercies are over all His works,’ to the end of Time. So that the sigh of ‘the first-born among many Brethren,’ here recorded, was expressive of His pity for every other child of Adam who shall be similarly afflicted forever.”

It strikes us that these words promise to be words of comfort to the deaf to whom they may come, and that even those, who theoretically recoil from such a mode of interpretation, will devotionally press the same to heart, what time they feel themselves, by reason of infirmity, burdened in spirit. It also seems to us that such interpretation exalts the dignity of the Saviour, and is according to the analogy of faith, from beginning to the end of Holy Writ. The passage in hand also reminds us of the one point we are seeking to make in our entire discussion of this subject—that it is by patient meditation on the narrative given, every word of which is Divine, that the most fruitful and salutary views of Holy Scriptures grow up in the mind. Take the inspired words, “He sighed and looked up to Heaven”—let one think of them—and meditate upon them—especially let one who is burdened in spirit do so—let him dwell upon the Image of that Saviour, of Whose Body he is a member, as so doing—and will it not help the man in his sorrows, will it not add to his knowledge of

* Plain Commentary, p. 326.

Christ? It certainly strikes us that any Christian objector to the Patristic method, if set in the midst of infidel reasoners to defend the truth, would be glad enough to implore the Lord Jesus to lay His finger on his lips, nay, to touch his tongue with the moisture of His Divine Mouth. Just what it means, that the holy spittle from the Incarnate Word should have been applied to the flesh of the elect, we may not know, but since the Incarnate Word did Himself so apply it, and since God the Holy Ghost has taken care that we should know it, we might suppose no one of Christ's worshipers should find difficulty in *thinking of it*—we know that no one, who had learned to find Christ in the Book of the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, as the Christian Fathers may teach us, would ever stumble at *such* a record in the Holy Gospels.

We will indulge in one more extract. The author is commenting on St. Luke x, 42, 43.

"Mary had chosen *one* thing: Martha was troubled about *many*. The double repetition of her name is a note of special earnestness."

"He reads the Gospel to little purpose who finds here nothing beyond the account of two sisters,—one engrossed with worldly business, the other devoted to Religion; of whom one incurs rebuke, and the other commendation. Martha is a great saint, no less than her sister; and St. John's record is express, that 'JESUS loved Martha.'† She is here engaged in the active service of CHRIST, and doubtless had chosen for herself a very blessed portion, when she determined to minister to the human want of her LORD. Behold, He has journeyed, and is weary, and 'hath not where to lay His head.‡' She has invited Him to her dwelling, and He has come to bless 'her house' with His presence. Shall she not exert herself in an hour like this? and by the pains she takes to entertain Him well, seek to testify the largeness of her gratitude, and love, and joy? If hospitality be ever honorable,§ how much more on an occasion like the present!

"Not until she seeks to draw her sister away from CHRIST, therefore, is a syllable addressed to her in the way of reproof. The act of hospitality, which so occupies her, cannot but be most acceptable in the eyes of her Divine guest, who says not, that she has chosen a *bad* part, but only that Mary has chosen a *better*.

"'Why better?' asks Augustine. 'Because it shall not be taken away from her.' From thee, the burden of business shall one time be taken away, for when thou comest into the heavenly country, thou wilt find no stranger to receive with hospitality. But for thy good it shall be taken away, that what is better may be given thee. Trouble shall be taken away, that rest may be given thee. But in the meantime, *thou* art yet at sea; thy *SISTER* is in port.'

"These words prepare us for another remark of the same great writer; namely, that Martha was occupied, as the Church of CHRIST is occupied here below, in the active service of CHRIST; Mary, as the same Church, will be engaged hereafter in Heaven,—in devout adoration of His perfections. Our Fathers in the Faith, delighted in taking a somewhat similar view of the entire transaction,—when they pointed out, that these two sisters respectively symbolize the active and the contemplative side of the religious life; both excellent—yet the contemplative the more excellent of the two; for it is 'that good part which

* Compare St. Luke xxii, 31.

† St. John xi, 5.

‡ St. Matt. viii, 20, and St. Luke ix, 58.

§ Rom. xii, 13; 1 Tim. iii, 2; Titus i, 8; Heb. xiii, 2; 1st Peter iv, 8.

shall not be taken away,'—but rather endure throughout the ages of Eternity, and become perfected by the presence of Him who is its object.* The practical life has its own honors, and its own reward. Those who pursue it are only *then* to be checked, when they would cast blame on the conduct of such as have chosen the Word of God for their study,† and Christ Himself for their portion."‡

It is time for us now to confess that all the above quotations from the Plain Commentary are of passages objected to in a late review of the work, and have been made accordingly with the view of showing what amount of legitimate and edifying comment the passages in question might contain. It would be impossible for us to attempt to set forth the merits of this remarkable Book, by way of a selection of extracts of our own. We have never read one page of the work without profit and delight,—we could not make selections where all is so excellent. For one who has never used the work, and is desirous of knowing what it is like, we would say, turn to any page in the Comment on the Gospel of St. John. For one who would become acquainted with most of its characteristic excellencies, without a regular reading, we would say, take the review of the work in the April Number of the *Protestant Quarterly*, and turn successively to every passage, against which the Reviewer has brought his objections, and *read the passage through*. We make the proposition in no spirit of disrespect towards the Quarterly's Article. There is good reason in some of its objections, and some reason in most—and as they go over a considerable portion of the Volume, a reference to the places will make the reader acquainted with the general character of the Commentary, and at the same time show what degree of force the objections really possess.

The Review in question contains one sentence, at which we must be allowed to express unqualified surprise and regret. In the thirty-fourth verse of the nineteenth Chapter of St. John's Gospel, it is written—"But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and forthwith came there out Blood and Water." In the thirty-fifth verse—the verse following—it is written, "And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth that he saith truth, that ye might believe."

One of the most popular, and one of the most pernicious of Modern Notes on the Gospels, has affirmed of this remarkable passage, that what is here called water "*appeared to be*

* Compare St. John xvi. 22.

† Ps. cxix, 18, 24, 54, 72, 97, 103, 105, 127, 162, &c.

‡ Ps. xvi, 5; lxxiii, 26; cxix, 57; cxlii, 5, &c. &c. Plain Commentary, p. 493.

such to St. John," but was in reality a "serous matter resembling water;" and that the "effect was a natural one, and would follow in any other case!" Of language such as this, the author of the Plain Commentary says, that they who use it "know not what they say." We should suppose that every orthodox believer in Inspired Scripture would agree with him, and say at least as much. Surely, it cannot be the deliberate purpose of the Author of the Review in question to take sides with an interpretation, which is no whit short of downright, willful Rationalism! And yet, he says, according to the reading of the sentence referred to, that "he [the author of the Plain Commentary] might have thrust aside, with somewhat less of abhorrence, the critical comments of men who have studied the Scriptures in no undiscerning or profane spirit," and "who may have thought they discovered a natural cause for the effect which followed the wound inflicted by the spear, without supposing they were to be dismissed with the sentence, 'they know not what they say.'" If the affirming that to be a resemblance of water, which the Holy Spirit with a solemnity of iteration which will scarcely find a parallel in the Records of Inspiration has declared and pronounced to be Water, is not a studying of the Scriptures with a profane spirit, we would ask what is. Is *this* a quality of that "Biblical criticism," which shall not only be diligent, reverential, and learned, but also open, honest, wise, and comprehensive; which shall not so seek for obscurer meanings and doubtful and distant relations as to pass by such as are broader and more obvious, and which shall never speak of a "pious supposition," and seek to exercise a kind of holy ingenuity where the question is but one of 'TRUTH?' If so, may we keep to the suppositions of the Fathers, which at least are pious, and to the ingenuities of the Fathers, which at least are holy.

A short paragraph of the Commentary will help us to a concluding remark. The comment is upon the words, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me; for he wrote of Me."

"A wondrous declaration, truly, if we consider who is the Speaker.* O! to have known what He said on this subject to Cleopas and his companions as they went to Emmaus! But the Books of Moses are in our hands. *Where* then does he write of CHRIST? Shall it suffice to appeal to ten or twenty places in the Pentateuch—such as the reader will find enumerated at the foot of the page?† Surely, those places do not come up to the largeness of our Lord's statement!

* Compare St. John i, 45; St. Luke xxiv, 27; Acts xxviii, 23.

† Gen. iii, 15; xii, 3; xviii, 18; xxvi, 4; xlix, 10; Numb. xxi, 9; Dent. xviii, 15, 18.

Where does Moses say that 'CHRIST should suffer?' or 'that He should be the first that should rise from the dead?' or that He 'should show Light unto the people, and to the Gentiles?' And yet St. Paul found some, if not all of these things in 'Moses.*' The plain truth is, that *we do not thoroughly understand the Bible*; and the next best thing to understanding it, is to know that we understand it not.†

It is very certain that we do thoroughly understand the Bible exactly in proportion as we understand it to testify of Christ. It is equally certain that, for some reason, the Patristic method of interpretation did find Christ spoken of in the Scriptures, far more frequently, and, we think, far more thoroughly, than the modern; "the Cross of Christ shines dimly" in the Modern Commentary. Our own belief is, that the reason of the difference between the two methods is to be found in the fact, that the Ancients had a *sense of the Church* which we have, comparatively, lost; which, in our case, seldom deepens to more than a sentiment. They use familiarly a language concerning the Church as Christ's Body, concerning the Elect as Christ's members, which strains our spirits to comprehend; except it be at such time as our spirits are at the point of prayer. Here, indeed, we can *feel*, what the Fathers were able to *write*; but what the prevalent Biblical apparatus gives little assistance in. We will venture to say, of all who make the Psalms their daily Manual, that they have found the Lord in a thousand places where no Modern Commentary finds Him. And this remark suggests another consideration, which must be taken into the account in seeking to make out the reason of the profound Messianic characteristic of the Patristic method; those Fathers commented on the Bible *from their knees*, modern scholars, for the most part, comment on the Bible *from their desks*.

This much, however, we can distinctly perceive as to the modus operandi of the Patristic method, that it sought after Christ in Holy Scripture by the aid of obscure intimations, of remote allusions, of those identical things which *we* call the "little things," and the "natural order" of the narrative—in a word, by the aid of that very class of things which we cannot doubt our Lord Himself brought to view for the two disciples on the way to Emmaus—cannot doubt, because such is the almost universal character of the Messianic verifications given in the New Testament. Let one take up the argument of our Lord's Messiahship with a view of convincing a Jew, and see what he would do if required to abstain from the so called

* See Acts xxvi, 22, 23.

† Plain Commentary, p. 687.

"small things" of the prophetic fulfillment. It is at this point especially that the intellectual pride of the modern method, which goes by the name of sense and manliness, finds its chief cause of offense, and it is at this point it must return to faith and let the child teach the man. When modern criticism has bowed in reverent wonder, as it should, over the mystery of Godliness in the manger at Bethlehem, over the verification of prophecy in the unparted garment; when it remembers how its own heart has been sustained by what these Divine lips uttered concerning the sparrow's fall, and considers how the "small things" of the word of Inspiration have ever been the very strongholds of the whole earthly Body as it bears forward under its earthly trials—then perchance may arise the thought "what as yet have we, or could we bear, more than *intimations* of Heavenly and Eternal verities"—and so may it come to take a wise and salutary heed of that which is written, "If I have told you of earthly things and ye believed not, how could you believe if I told you of Heavenly;" then will it be careful never to call that common which has been sanctified by God, or that little which has come forth of His Son.

When such shall come to be the happy case with it, it will begin to find that its comment will make more of the analogy of faith than of the analogies of language, it will trace a prophetic hint with greater earnestness than now it traces a verbal form, and it will find the Lord Jesus in that very word which as yet it only takes to be one of the "parts of speech." The result will be that the Modern Comment shall become truly edifying where now it is "exceeding dry;" it will be spiritually profound, where now it is intellectually vain and superficial, it will be a delight where now it is a weariness; it will be everywhere as a natural, rich, and fruitful Garden, where now it is for the most part an artificial and most unsatisfying Plot. Of the truth of this, the Plain Commentary furnishes, we think, a most remarkable and triumphant illustration. It is our belief that, if we can be brought to that habitual meditation on the Life and Actions of our Blessed Lord, to which these precious volumes invite us, we shall be brought to that very thing which most we need, and in which the age we live in helps us forward least. May the Plain Commentary soon find a place in the hands of every family of the Church; we are sure its "comfortable words" will soon find their place in every heart.

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

EARLY JOURNALS OF GENERAL CONVENTIONS.*

JOURNAL
OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
BISHOPS, CLERGY AND LAITY,
OF THE
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
IN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
IN A
CONVENTION,

HELD IN

The City of Philadelphia, from Tuesday, September 29th, to Friday,
October 16th, 1789.

PREFACE.

AT a Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia and South Carolina, held in Christ Church, in the city of Philadelphia, from July 28th to August 8th, 1789; upon the consideration of certain communications from the Bishop and Clergy of the Church in Connecticut, and from the Clergy in the Churches of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, it was resolved to adjourn to the 29th day of September following, in order to meet the said Churches, for the purpose of settling articles of union, discipline, uniformity of worship, and general government among all the Churches in the United States.

* Continued from Vol. XII, p. 334.

The following is a Journal of the Proceedings of both Houses, (viz. of Bishops, and of Clerical and Lay Deputies) in the said adjourned Convention.

JOURNAL, &c.

CHRIST CHURCH, *Tuesday, September 29th, 1789.*

THE Right Rev. Dr. White, the Rev. Dr. William Smith, the Rev. Dr. Robert Smith, the Rev. Mr. Bend, Robert Andrews, esquire, and Dr. Gerardus Clarkson met at Christ Church; but, not being a sufficient number to proceed to business,

Adjourned until ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

CHRIST CHURCH, *Wednesday, September 30th, 1789.*

The Convention met.

The Right Rev. Dr. White presided, *ex officio*.

The Rev. Mr. Bracken read prayers.

The Rev. Mr. Bracken, clerical deputy from the Church in Virginia, produced* testimonials of his appointment, which being read, and approved, he took his seat.

The Right Rev. Dr. Samuel Seabury, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Connecticut, attended, to confer with the Convention, agreeably to the invitation given him, in consequence of a resolve passed at their late session; and the Rev. Dr. Samuel Parker, deputy from the Churches in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and the Rev. Mr. Bela Hubbard, and the Rev. Mr. Abraham Jarvis, deputies from the Church in Connecticut, produced testimonials of their appointment to confer with the Convention, in consequence of a similar invitation.

Their testimonials were read and deemed satisfactory.

The Right Rev. Dr. Seabury produced his letters of consecration to the holy office of a Bishop in this Church, which were read, and ordered to be recorded. [See the Appendix.]

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Secretary, the Hon. Francis Hopkinson, esquire, be permitted and requested to appoint an assistant Secretary, who is not a member of this Convention.

Resolved, That this Convention will, to-morrow, go into a Committee of the whole, on the subject of the proposed union with the Churches in the states of New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut, as now represented in Convention.

Resolved further, That the hours of business in Convention shall be, from nine o'clock in the morning until three in the afternoon. Adjourned.

* This being an adjourned Convention, testimonials were only required from new members.

CHRIST CHURCH, *Thursday, October 1st, 1789.*

The Convention met.

The Rev. Mr. Rowe read prayers.

The Rev. Dr. Beach, from New York, the Rev. Mr. Frazer, and James Parker, esquire, from New Jersey, and James Sykes, esquire, from Delaware, took their seats in Convention.

Mr. Joseph Borden Hopkinson was admitted an assistant Secretary.

Mr. John Rumsey produced credentials as a lay deputy from the state of Maryland, and was admitted to his seat.

The meeting in Christ Church being found inconvenient to the members, in several respects—

On motion, *Resolved*, That the Rev. Dr. William Smith and the Hon. Mr. Secretary Hopkinson, be appointed to wait upon his Excellency Thomas Mifflin, esquire, the President of the state, and to request leave for the Convention to hold their meeting in some convenient apartment in the State House.

The Convention then resolved itself into a Committee of the whole, agreeably to the order of the day.

The Rev. Dr. Robert Smith in the chair ;

And after some time rose, and reported the following resolve, viz :—

Resolved, That for the better promotion of an union of this Church with the eastern Churches, the general Constitution established at the last session of this Convention is yet open to amendments and alterations, by virtue of the powers delegated to this Convention.

The question being put on this report, and a division called for, it was determined in the affirmative.

On motion, *Resolved*, That a Committee be appointed to confer with the deputies from the eastern Churches, on the subject of the proposed union with those Churches : Whereupon,

The Rev. Dr. William Smith, Rev. Dr. Robert Smith, Rev. Dr. Benjamin Moore, Richard Harrison and Tench Coxe, esquires, were chosen for this purpose.

The Rev. Dr. William Smith and Hon. Mr. Hopkinson reported, that the President of the state had very politely given permission, to the Convention to hold their meetings at the State House, in the apartments of the General Assembly, until they shall be wanted for the public service.

Adjourned, to meet at the State House to morrow morning.

STATE HOUSE, in the City of Philadelphia,

Friday, October 2d, 1789.

The Convention met.

The Rev. Dr. Robert Smith read prayers.

The Rev. Dr. William Smith, from the Committee appointed to confer with the deputies from the Churches of New Hampshire, Massachusetts and Connecticut, concerning a plan of union among all the Protest-

ant Episcopal Churches in the United States of America, reported as follows, viz:—

“That they have had a full, free and friendly conference with the deputies of the said Churches, who, on behalf of the Church in their several states, and by virtue of sufficient authority from them, have signified, that they do not object to the Constitution, which was approved at the former session of this Convention, if the third Article of that Constitution may be so modified, as to declare explicitly the right of the Bishops, when sitting in a separate House, to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the other House of Convention; and to negative such acts proposed by the other House, as they may disapprove.

“Your Committee, conceiving this alteration to be desirable in itself, as having a tendency to give greater stability to the Constitution, without diminishing any security that is now possessed by the Clergy or Laity; and being sincerely impressed with the importance of an union to the future prosperity of the Church, do therefore recommend to the Convention a compliance with the wishes of their brethren, and that the third Article of the Constitution may be altered accordingly. Upon such alteration being made, it is declared by the deputies from the Churches in the eastern states, that they will subscribe the Constitution, and become members of this General Convention.”

Upon special motion, the above report was read a second time; whereupon the following resolution was proposed, viz:—

Resolved, That this Convention do adopt that part of the report of the Committee, which proposes to modify the third Article of the Constitution, so as to declare explicitly “the right of the Bishops, when sitting in a separate House, to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the other House of Convention; and to negative such acts proposed by the other House, as they may disapprove; provided they are not adhered to by four-fifths of the other House.”

After some debate, the resolution, with the proviso annexed, was agreed upon, and the third Article was accordingly modified in the manner following, viz:—

Art. 3d. The Bishops of this Church, when there shall be three or more, shall, whenever General Conventions are held, form a separate House, with a right to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the House of Deputies, composed of Clergy and Laity; and when any proposed act shall have passed the House of Deputies, the same shall be transmitted to the House of Bishops, who shall have a negative thereupon, unless adhered to by four-fifths of the other House; and all acts of the Convention shall be authenticated by both Houses. And, in all cases, the House of Bishops shall signify to the Convention their approbation or disapprobation, the latter, with their reasons in writing, within three days after the proposed act shall have been reported to them for concurrence; and in failure thereof, it shall have the operation of a law. But until there shall be three or more Bishops, as aforesaid, any Bishop attending a General Convention shall be a member ex-officio, and

shall vote with the clerical deputies of the state to which he belongs; and a Bishop shall then preside.

On motion, *Resolved*, That it be made known to the several State Conventions, that it is proposed to consider and determine in the next General Convention, on the propriety of investing the House of Bishops with a full negative upon the proceedings of the other House.

Ordered, That the general Constitution of this Church, as now altered and amended, be laid before the Right Rev. Dr. Seabury, and the deputies from the Churches in the eastern states, for their approbation and assent.

After a short time, they delivered the following testimony of their assent to the same, viz :

October 2d, 1789.

WE do hereby agree to the Constitution of the Church, as modified this day in Convention.

Samuel Seabury, D. D. Bishop of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut.

Abraham Jarvis, A. M. Rector of Christ Church,)

Middletown,)

Bela Hubbard, A. M. Rector of Trinity Church,)

New Haven,)

State of
Connecticut.

Samuel Parker, D. D. Rector of Trinity Church, Boston, and Clerical Deputy for Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

After subscribing as above, the Right Rev. Bishop Seabury, and the clerical deputies aforesaid, took their seats, as members of the Convention.

On motion, the Rev. Dr. Parker and Rev. Mr. Jarvis, were added to the Committee for revising the Canons. Adjourned.

STATE HOUSE, *Saturday, October 3d, 1789.*

The Convention met.

The Rev. Mr. Ogden read prayers.

Mr. Charles Goldsborough produced the credentials of his appointment as a lay deputy from the Church in Maryland, and took his seat accordingly.

The Right Rev. Bishop White informed the Convention, that he had received certain letters from the Right Rev. Bishop Provost, with a request that they may be communicated to the Convention; which were read accordingly.

On motion, *Resolved*, That, agreeably to the Constitution of the Church, as altered and confirmed, there is now in this Convention a separate House of Bishops.

The Bishops now withdrawing, the President's chair was declared vacant; whereupon the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies proceeded to the election of a President by ballot, and the Rev. William Smith, D. D. clerical deputy from Maryland, (Provost of the College of Philadelphia) was duly chosen and took the chair accordingly.

Resolved, That seats be provided on the right hand of the chair, for the accommodation of the Bishops, when they shall choose to be present at the proceedings and debates of this House.

Here ends the Journal of the Proceedings of the Convention, as consisting of a Single House. The Journals of the two Houses will now follow, separately; to which will be prefixed the General Ecclesiastical Constitution, as subscribed and entered on the Book of Records, which will answer the intention, as well of exhibiting a list of the Members of both Houses in Convention, as of defining their separate rights and powers.

The Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

ART. 1. THERE shall be a General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, on the second Tuesday of September, in the year of our Lord 1792, and on the second Tuesday of September in every third year afterwards, in such place as shall be determined by the Convention; and special meetings may be called at other times, in the manner hereafter to be provided for; and this Church, in a majority of the states which shall have adopted this Constitution, shall be represented, before they shall proceed to business; except that the representation from two states shall be sufficient to adjourn; and in all business of the Convention, freedom of debate shall be allowed.

ART. 2. The Church in each state shall be entitled to a representation of both the Clergy and the Laity, which representation shall consist of one or more deputies, not exceeding four of each order, chosen by the Convention of the state; and, in all questions, when required by the Clerical or Lay representation from any state, each order shall have one vote; and the majority of suffrages by states shall be conclusive in each order, provided such majority comprehend a majority of the states represented in that order: The concurrence of both orders shall be necessary to constitute a vote of the Convention. If the Convention of any state should neglect or decline to appoint clerical deputies, or if they should neglect or decline to appoint lay deputies, or if any of those of either order appointed should neglect to attend, or be prevented by sickness or any other accident, such state shall, nevertheless, be considered as duly represented by such deputy or deputies as may attend, whether lay or clerical. And if, through the neglect of the Convention of any of the Churches which shall have adopted, or may hereafter adopt, this Constitution, no deputies, either lay or clerical, should attend at any General Convention; the Church in such state shall nevertheless be bound by the acts of such Convention.

ART. 3. The Bishops of this Church, when there shall be three or more, shall, whenever General Conventions are held, form a separate House, with a right to originate and propose acts, for the concurrence

of the House of Deputies, composed of Clergy and Laity; and when any proposed act shall have passed the House of Deputies, the same shall be transmitted to the House of Bishops, who shall have a negative thereupon, unless adhered to by four fifths of the other House; and all acts of the Convention shall be authenticated by both Houses. And, in all cases, the House of Bishops shall signify to the Convention their approbation or disapprobation (the latter, with their reasons in writing) within three days after the proposed act shall have been reported to them for concurrence; and, in failure thereof, it shall have the operation of a law. But until there shall be three or more Bishops, as aforesaid, any Bishop attending a General Convention shall be a member, *ex officio*, and shall vote with the clerical deputies of the state to which he belongs; and a Bishop shall then preside.

ART. 4. The Bishop or Bishops in every state shall be chosen agreeably to such rules as shall be fixed by the Convention of that state: And every Bishop of this Church shall confine the exercise of his Episcopal office to his proper diocese or district; unless requested to ordain, or confirm, or perform any other act of the Episcopal office, by any Church destitute of a Bishop.

ART. 5. A Protestant Episcopal Church in any of the United States, not now represented, may, at any time hereafter, be admitted, on acceding to this Constitution.

ART. 6. In every state, the mode of trying Clergymen shall be instituted by the Convention of the Church therein. At every trial of a Bishop, there shall be one or more of the Episcopal order present; and none but a Bishop shall pronounce sentence of deposition or degradation from the ministry on any Clergyman, whether Bishop, or Presbyter, or Deacon.

ART. 7. No person shall be admitted to Holy Orders, until he shall have been examined by the Bishop and by two Presbyters, and shall have exhibited such testimonials and other requisites, as the Canons, in that case provided, may direct. Nor shall any person be ordained until he shall have subscribed the following declaration: "I do believe the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation: And I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States." No person ordained by a foreign Bishop shall be permitted to officiate as a Minister of this Church until he shall have complied with the Canon or Canons in that case provided, and have also subscribed the aforesaid declaration.

ART. 8. A book of Common Prayer, administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, articles of religion, and a form and manner of making, ordaining and consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons, when established by this or a future General Convention, shall be used in the Protestant Episcopal Church in those states which shall have adopted this Constitution.

ART. 9. This Constitution shall be unalterable, unless in General Con-

vention, by the Church in a majority of the states, which may have adopted the same; and all alterations shall be first proposed in one General Convention, and made known to the several State Conventions before they shall be finally agreed to, or ratified, in the ensuing General Convention.

Done in General Convention of the Bishops, Clergy and Laity of the Church, the second day of October, 1789, and ordered to be transcribed into the Book of Records, and subscribed, which was done as follows, viz.

In the House of Bishops.

Samuel Seabury, D. D. Bishop of Connecticut.

William White, D. D. Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Pennsylvania.

In the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

William Smith, D. D. President of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, and Clerical Deputy from Maryland.

New Hampshire and Massachusetts. Samuel Parker, D. D. Rector of Trinity Church, Boston.

Connecticut. Bela Hubbard, A. M. Rector of Trinity Church, New Haven; Abraham Jarvis, A. M. Rector of Christ Church, Middletown.

New York. Benjamin Moore, D. D. Abraham Beach, D. D. Assistant Ministers of Trinity Church, city of New York; Richard Harrison, Lay Deputy from the state of New York.

New Jersey. Uzal Ogden, Rector of Trinity Church, Newark; William Frazer, A. M. Rector of St. Michael's Church, Trenton, and St. Andrew's Church, Amwell; Samuel Ogden, Robert Stretzell Jones, Lay Deputies.

Pennsylvania. Samuel Magaw, D. D. Rector of St. Paul's, Philadelphia; Robert Blackwell, D. D. Senior Assistant Minister of Christ Church and St. Peters', Philadelphia; Joseph G. J. Bend, Assistant Minister of Christ Church and St. Peters', Philadelphia; Joseph Pilmore, Rector of the United Churches of Trinity, St. Thomas's, and All Saints; Gerardus Clarkson, Tench Coxe, Francis Hopkinson, Samuel Powell, Lay Deputies from the state of Pennsylvania.

Delaware. Joseph Cowden, A. M. Rector of St. Anne's; Robert Clay, Rector of Emanuel and St. James's Churches.

Maryland. John Bisset, A. M. Rector of Shrewsbury Parish, Kent county; John Rumsey, Charles Goldsborough, Lay Deputies.

Virginia. John Bracken, Rector of Bruton Parish, Williamsburg; Robert Andrews, Lay Deputy.

South Carolina. Robert Smith, D. D. Rector of St. Philip's Church, Charleston; William Smith, William Brisbane, Lay Deputies from the state of South Carolina.

¶ Sundry other members attended this Convention at different times of sitting, but were absent on the day of signing the Constitution. See the names occasionally entered on the Journal.

JOURNAL

OF THE

HOUSE OF CLERICAL AND LAY DEPUTIES.

STATE HOUSE, *Saturday, October 3d, 1789.*

THE Bishops, having withdrawn, and a President being chosen as aforesaid, the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies proceeded to business, as follows, *viz.*

The Committee on the canons being called upon, reported progress, and had leave to sit again.

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed to prepare a calendar and tables of lessons for morning and evening prayer, throughout the year; also collects, epistles and gospels;—and Rev. Dr. Parker, Rev. Dr. Moore, Rev. Mr. Bend, Dr. Clarkson and Rev. Mr. Jarvis were chosen for this purpose.

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed to prepare a morning and evening service for the use of the Church.—The Rev. Mr. Hubbard, Rev. Dr. Robert Smith, Rev. Dr. Blackwell, Mr. Rumsey and Mr. Andrews were chosen.

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed to prepare a Litany, with occasional prayers and thanksgivings; and Rev. Dr. Beach, Rev. Mr. Bracken, Rev. Mr. Bisset, Mr. Hopkinson and Mr. Goldsborough were chosen.

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed, to prepare an order for the administration of the Holy Communion;—and Rev. Mr. Pilmore, Rev. Mr. Ogden, Col. Ogden, Rev. Mr. Frazer and Mr. Sykes were appointed.

Adjourned to Monday morning.

STATE HOUSE, *Monday, October 5th, 1789.*

The House met.

The Rev. Mr. Bisset read prayers.

William Smith, Esq. from South Carolina, took his seat in the House.

The standing Committee, appointed at the former session of this Convention, made report as follows:—"That they had forwarded the address to the most Reverend the Archbishop of Canterbury and York; and that they prepared and forwarded answers to the Reverend Dr. Parker, and the Clergy of Massachusetts and New Hampshire; that they answered, as far as was necessary, the letters of the Right Reverend Bishop Seabury; that they notified to the Church in the several states, not included in this union, the time and place to which the Convention had adjourned, and requested their sending deputies to the same, for the good purposes of union and General Government; and that they

inclosed, in each of the communications mentioned in this report, a copy of the minutes and proceedings of this Convention at their last session.

The Rev. Mr. Bisset and the Rev. Mr. Bend were appointed to assist the Secretary in preparing the minutes for the press.

The Committee on the morning and evening service reported a morning service, which was read, and afterwards considered by paragraphs.

Adjourned.

STATE HOUSE, *Tuesday, October 6th, 1789.*

The House met.

The Rev. Mr. Bend read prayers.

The Committee on the Litany, &c. reported a Litany, which was read, and ordered to lie on the table.

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed, to report in what manner the Psalms should be used; whereupon the following members were elected, by ballot, for that service: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Hopkinson, Rev. Dr. Moore, Rev. Dr. Parker, and Rev. Dr. Robert Smith.

The Convention then resumed the consideration of the report on the morning service, and having made farther progress therein, Adjourned to Thursday morning.

STATE HOUSE, *Thursday, October 8th, 1789.*

The House met.

The Rev. Dr. Parker read prayers.

The Reverend Mr. Bloomer, from New York, Mr. Brisbane, from South Carolina, and the Rev. Dr. Magaw, from Pennsylvania, took their seats in the House.

The Rev. Mr. Hubbard was chosen Vice President of this House.

The Convention resumed the consideration of the report on the morning service, and completed the same.

Ordered, That it be transcribed, and authenticated by the President and Secretary, and that the Rev. Dr. R. Smith and Mr. Andrews carry it to the House of Bishops for their concurrence.

Ordered, That the Rev. Dr. Parker and Rev. Mr. Bend, of the Committee on the lessons, calendar, &c. carry their report as far as they have prepared it, to the House of Bishops, for their consideration.

Mr. Harrison and Mr. Rumsey obtained leave of absence.

Adjourned.

STATE HOUSE, *Friday, October 9th, 1789.*

The House met.

The Rev. Dr. Magaw read prayers.

The Committee on the morning and evening service reported an evening service, which was read and ordered to lie on the table.

The Committee on the communion service made a report, which was read, and ordered to lie on the table.

The report on the Litany was then taken up, and some progress made in the consideration thereof.

Adjourned.

STATE HOUSE, *Saturday, October 10th, 1789.*

The House met.

The Rev. Mr. Frazer read prayers.

The Committee on the calendar, &c. brought in the remainder of their report, which was ordered to be laid before the House of Bishops.

The House then resumed the consideration of the report on the litany, and completed the same.

Ordered, That the litany be transcribed, and authenticated by the President and Secretary.

The proposed tables of lessons for Sundays and other Holy Days, were returned by the House of Bishops, with some amendments.

On motion, the tables of lessons for Sundays and other Holy Days, as amended by the House of Bishops, were re-committed to the Committee appointed to prepare them.

The committee appointed to report in what manner the psalms shall be used, made a report, which was read, agreed to, and directed to be transmitted to the House of Bishops.

The evening service was then considered, amended, and ordered to be transcribed and authenticated; and the Rev. Dr. Beach and Rev. Mr. Bisset were appointed to carry it to the House of Bishops, for their concurrence.

The report on the communion service was taken up, and some progress made in the consideration thereof.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, with their assent to the calendar, the epistles and gospels, and proposing certain amendments to the collects laid before them; which amendments were agreed to.

Mr. Ogden had leave of absence.

It having been notified, that the public service of the state of Pennsylvania would require the use of the State house during the present week;

Adjourned to meet at Christ Church on Monday morning next.

CHRIST CHURCH, *Monday, October 12th, 1789.*

The Convention met, and it being represented that convenient apartments might be had in the College of Philadelphia for the meeting of both Houses of Convention, during the remainder of the present session;

Adjourned, to meet at the College immediately.

COLLEGE of Philadelphia, *Monday, October 12th, 1789.*

The House met.

The Rev. Mr. Frazer read prayers.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, returning the proposed litany and form of morning prayer, with amendments, and proposing a form of public baptism of infants.

The committee, appointed to consider the amendments of the House of Bishops to the tables of lessons for Sundays, &c. advised a concurrence of this house in the said amendments.

Resolved, That this report be agreed to, and that the said tables of lessons be authenticated.

The House then took up the amendments proposed by the House of Bishops to the form of morning prayer and the litany, some of which were adopted, and others non-concurred.

Ordered, That they be transmitted to the House of Bishops, with the determination of this house.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, proposing a form for the solemnization of matrimony; also, amendments to the report concerning the psalms. These amendments were considered, some agreed to, and others non-concurred.

Ordered, That the House of Bishops be informed of the said determination.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, proposing an order for the visitation of the sick.

Resolved, That, in future, this house will meet at nine o'clock in the morning, and adjourn at two in the afternoon, to meet again at four.

Adjourned till to-morrow morning.

COLLEGE of Philadelphia, *Tuesday, October 13th, 1789.*

The House met.

The Rev. Dr. Beach read prayers.

The report on the communion service was resumed, considered by paragraphs, and agreed to.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, proposing a form of burial service, and the order in which the psalter shall be used; and also requesting a conference with this house on the proposed amendments of the morning prayer and litany.

It was agreed that this request should be complied with, at five o'clock this afternoon. The Secretary was ordered to inform the House of Bishops of this, and he returned with their concurrence. Adjourned.

Four o'clock, P. M.

The House met.

Resolved, That the intended conference with the House of Bishops be deferred to a future time.

The Rev. Dr. Parker and Rev. Dr. Moore, were desired to inform the House of Bishops of this resolution, and returned with the concurrence of that house.

Six additional collects, reported by the committee on the communion service, were considered and agreed to, and with the communion

service, ordered to be transcribed, and transmitted to the House of Bishops.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, proposing the manner and form of setting forth the book of psalms in metre.

The committee on the litany, &c. reported certain occasional prayers and thanksgivings, which, with some few amendements, were adopted, and ordered to be transmitted to the House of Bishops.

The Convention then took up the form of public baptism of infants, which they amended, and returned to the House of Bishops.

On motion, *Resolved*, That the following clause be added to the seventh canon of this church.

Unless it shall be recommended to the Bishop, by two-thirds of the State Convention to which he belongs, to dispense with the aforesaid requisition, in whole or in part; which recommendation shall only be for good causes moving thereunto, and shall be in the following words, with the signature of the names of the majority of such Convention:—
"We, whose names are underwritten, are of opinion, that the dispensing with the knowledge of the Latin and Greek languages (or either of them, as the case may be) in the examination of A. B. for holy orders, will be of use to the church of which we are the Convention, in consideration of other qualifications of the said A. B. for the gospel ministry."

The above clause being sent to the House of Bishops, received their concurrence. Adjourned.

COLLEGE of Philadelphia, *Wednesday, October 14th, 1789.*

The House met.

The Rev. Dr. Parker read prayers.

The form for the solemnization of matrimony was considered, and amended, and transmitted to the House of Bishops.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, informing, that they had passed the form of public baptism of infants, with the amendements of this house, and proposing a form for the private baptism of infants, and a form of baptism of those of riper years. Adjourned.

Four o'clock, P. M.

The House met.

The burial service was considered, amended, and transmitted to the House of Bishops.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, with amendements to the communion service, and with the form for the solemnization of matrimony, which they had passed, as amended by this house.

The amendements to the communion service were considered, amended, and transmitted to the House of Bishops; and the service, thus amended, was, with the six additional collects, assented to, and returned by the said house. Adjourned.

COLLEGE of Philadelphia, *Thursday, October 15th, 1789.*

The House met.

The Rev. Mr. Pilmore read prayers.

The order in which the psalter shall be read was considered, and agreed to.

The House then went into a conference with the House of Bishops, which continued till two o'clock. Adjourned.

Four o'clock, P. M.

The House met.

The constitution, as copied in the book of records, was read and compared, and, having received an alteration as to the time of the future meetings of the Convention, was signed by both houses of Convention.

The committee on the canons reported certain canons, which, being considered and amended, were ratified, and transmitted to the House of Bishops.

The House again went into a conference with the House of Bishops, in the course of which it was agreed, that the book of common prayer to be set forth by this Convention, shall be in use from the 1st day of October, 1790.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, proposing a catechism, confirmation, and forms of prayers for families, and containing their assent to the burial service, except the first rubric; in their amendment to which this House concurred.

Dr. Parker obtained leave of absence after to-morrow noon.

On motion, the Rev. Dr. Blackwell, the Rev. Mr. Ogden, and Rev. Mr. Bisset, were appointed a committee, to report what farther measures are necessary to perpetuate the succession of Bishops in America. Adjourned.

COLLEGE of Philadelphia, *Friday, October 16th, 1789.*

The House met.

The Rev. Dr. Beach read prayers.

The House of Bishops returned the canons, with an amendment, in which this House concurred; and they also proposed a title page to the book of common prayer, which was read, and passed.

The canons now passed, together with those passed at the last session, being collected into one body, and ratified by both Houses, were directed to be entered in the Book of Records, and printed with the Journal of this Convention.

[See the Appendix.]*

The Rev. Mr. Bend proposed a table of proper psalms for certain days, which was passed and sent to the House of Bishops.

* To be given in next No. of the Review.

A preface and table of contents were sent to this House by the House of Bishops, which, with their concurrence, were referred to the committee to be appointed to superintend the publication of the book about to be issued by the Convention.

Tables for finding the Holy Days, and tables of the moveable and immoveable feasts, which had been proposed by the House of Bishops, were passed.

The House of Bishops returned the order of evening prayer, with an amendment, to which this House agreed.

They also transmitted to this House amendments to the occasional prayers and thanksgivings, and a form for the churching of women, a form of thanksgiving for the fruits of the earth, additional prayers for the visitation of the sick, and a form of ratification of the Prayer Book.

The amendments of the House of Bishops to the occasional prayers and thanksgivings were considered, and assented to.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, with their assent to the table of proper psalms; and proposing a form of prayer to be used at sea, and a form of prayer for the visitation of prisoners; also an order for the communion of the sick.

The manner and form of setting forth the book of psalms in metre was considered, amended, and returned to the House of Bishops.

The additional prayers for the visitation of the sick were considered, and passed with an amendment, to which the House of Bishops agreed.

The order for the visitation, and the order for the communion of the sick, were agreed to.

The form of the ratification of the book of common prayer was agreed to.

The House of Bishops proposed, for the adoption of this House, articles of religion, which, with the concurrence of the House of Bishops, were referred to a future Convention.

The form of the visitation of prisoners was then passed.

The form of thanksgiving for the fruits of the earth was assented to; also the form of prayer to be used at sea.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, with their assent to the amendments proposed to the manner and form of setting forth the book of psalms in metre.

The order for the administration of baptism of those of riper years was considered, and passed; also, the form of private baptism of infants.

A message was sent to the House of Bishops, proposing that the Ash Wednesday service, as set forth in the proposed book, should be adopted, instead of the commination formerly used; to which the House of Bishops assented.

The confirmation, and the forms of family morning and evening prayer, were considered, and adopted.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, proposing an alteration in the litany, which was sent back, with an amendment, in which the House of Bishops concurred.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, with their assent to the morning prayer, and the report on the psalms.
Adjourned.

Four o'clock, P. M.

The House met.

The catechism was considered, amended, and transmitted to the House of Bishops.

The form for the churching of women was agreed to; and it was resolved, with the concurrence of the House of Bishops, that the thanksgiving in the said form should be inserted among the occasional thanksgivings, and used, at the discretion of the Minister, instead of the whole office.

Resolved, That the Rev. Dr. William Smith, Rev. Dr. Magaw, Rev. Dr. Blackwell, Mr. Hopkinson, and Mr. Coxe, be a committee, to superintend the printing of the Book of Common Prayer, as set forth by this Convention, and that they advise with any person or persons who shall be appointed by the House of Bishops for the same purpose.

Resolved, That the committee appointed to superintend the printing of the Book of Common Prayer, &c. be instructed to have the selections of psalms, set forth by this church, printed immediately before the psalter; and, besides a full and complete edition of the said book, printed in folio or octavo, or in both, to have an edition published, to contain only the parts in general use and the collects of the day, with references to the epistles and gospels.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, with their assent to the catechism, as amended; and with information that the Right Reverend Bishop White consents to advise with the committee appointed by this House to superintend the printing of the Book of Common Prayer, &c.

Mr. Tench Coxe was elected Treasurer of the Convention.

The following gentlemen were appointed a standing committee to act during the recess of the Convention: The Reverend Dr. William Smith, ex officio, Reverend Dr. Parker, Reverend Mr. Hubbard, Reverend Dr. Beach, Mr. Harrison, Reverend Mr. Ogden, Mr. Jones, Reverend Dr. Blackwell, Mr. Hopkinson, Reverend Mr. Clay, Mr. Sykes, Reverend Mr. Bisset, Mr. Carmichael, Reverend Mr. Bracken, Mr. Andrews, Reverend Dr. Robert Smith, and Mr. Brisbane.

Resolved, That this committee, or a majority of them, have power to recommend to the Bishops the calling of special meetings of the Convention, when they think it necessary.

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this House, that the Bishops have a right, when they think it necessary, to call special Conventions.

The committee on the means of perpetuating the Episcopal succession in the United States of America, made the following report, which was read and adopted, viz.

The committee on the means of perpetuating the Episcopal succession in these United States, are of opinion,—

That the standing committee, which, agreeably to the constitution, is chosen, as above, to act during the recess of the General Convention, ought, in the name of the Convention, to recommend for consecration any person, who shall appear to them to be duly elected and qualified for the Episcopal office: That should any person, elected and qualified as above, be proposed, and should the answer from the English Archbishops be favourable to the intended plan of consecrating by the Right Rev. the Bishops Seabury, White and Provost, the committee shall write to the said three Bishops, intimating that it is the will and desire of the General Convention, that such consecration should, as soon as convenient, take place: That should the answer from England be unfavourable, or any obstacle occur, by the death of either of the three Bishops, or otherwise, the said committee shall recommend any Bishop elect to England, for consecration.

Resolved, That, with the concurrence of the House of Bishops, the next meeting of the Convention be in the city of New York.

Resolved, That the Right Rev. Bishop Seabury be requested to preach a sermon at the opening of the next Convention.

Signed by order of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

WILLIAM SMITH, President.

Francis Hopkinson, Secretary.

JOURNAL

OF

THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

In Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, held at the State House, in the city of Philadelphia, on Monday, the 5th day of October, in the year of our Lord 1789.

AFTER divine service in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, the House of Bishops met in the committee room of the honorable House of Assembly.

PRESENT.

The Right Reverend Samuel Seabury, D. D. and
The Right Reverend William White, D. D.

The following Rules are agreed on, and established, for the government of this House, viz:

1st. The senior Bishop present shall be the President; seniority to be reckoned from the dates of the letters of consecration.

2d. This House will authenticate its acts by the signing of the names of, at least, the majority of its members.

3d. There shall be a Secretary to this House.

In addition to the above, it is now established as a temporary rule, that this House will attend divine service, during the session, in the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The Rev. Joseph Clarkson, A. M. is appointed the Secretary of this House.

This House went into a review of the morning and evening prayer, and prepared some proposals on that subject.

Adjourned till ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

STATE HOUSE, *Tuesday, October 6th, 1789.*

After divine service,

Adjourned till nine o'clock on Thursday morning.

STATE HOUSE, *Thursday, October 8th, 1789.*

Divine service being over,

The House went into the consideration of the litany, and of the other parts of the service connected with the morning and evening prayer, and completed their proposals on that subject, excepting a few particulars, which they have noted as queries for their further consideration.

This House then proceeded to the consideration of the collects, epistles and gospels; and from them to the order for the administration of the holy communion; and having prepared their proposals on these parts of the service,

Adjourned till nine o'clock to-morrow morning.

STATE HOUSE, *Friday, October 9th, 1789.*

Divine service being over,

This House went into a review of the service for the public baptism of infants, and prepared proposals on that subject.

The House then received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Parker, and the Rev. Mr. Bend, informing, that they had prepared tables of lessons for Sundays, and other holy days, to be laid before this House, which were accordingly presented.

The House went immediately into the consideration of the above, during which there was received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Robert Smith and Robert Andrews, Esquire, with information, that they had prepared a form of morning prayer, to be laid before this House; which was accordingly presented.

The House then proceeded in their examination of the tables of lessons, and having prepared some amendments of the same,

Adjourned till nine o'clock to-morrow morning.

STATE HOUSE, *Saturday, October 10th, 1789.*

After divine service,

The House completed the instrument of amendments of the tables of lessons, and sent the same, by their Secretary, to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

This House then received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Parker, and the Rev. Mr. Bend, with information, that they had prepared proposals in regard to the calendar, and in regard to the collects, epistles and gospels; which were accordingly presented.

The House then went into the consideration of the proposed form of morning prayer, during which they received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Beach and the Rev. Mr. Bisset, with information, that they had prepared the litany to be laid before this House; which was accordingly presented.

The House then went on with the consideration of the morning prayer, when they received another message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Robert Smith and the Rev. Dr. Moore, with information, that they had prepared a selection of psalms; which was laid before the House.

The House, after preparing their amendments of the morning prayer for engrossing, proceeded to the consideration of the proposed litany, and prepared their amendments of that service, also, for engrossing.

They then proceeded to the consideration of the proposed calendar, and having assented to the same, returned it by their Secretary.

The House then proceeded to consider the proposals respecting the collects, epistles and gospels, and having prepared their amendments, sent them, by their Secretary, to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

A message was received by the Rev. Dr. Parker, from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, representing, that if this House were prepared to originate any parts of the service, it would be agreeable to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies to receive them on Monday morning.

Accordingly the Secretary is desired to prepare a copy of the proposed form of public baptism of infants.

The public service requiring the use of the room where this House sit,

Adjourned to the apparatus room of the College, there to meet on Monday morning, at nine o'clock.

COLLEGE of Philadelphia, *Monday, October 12th, 1789.*

Divine service being over,

The House of Bishops sent, by their Secretary, to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, their amendments of the morning prayer, and of the Litany, together with the alterations, originated in this House, of the ministration of the public baptism of infants.

This House received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Parker, informing that they agree to the amendments proposed in regard to the tables of lessons for Sundays, and other holy days, excepting the fourth amendment, on which they desire a conference.

This House withdrew the said fourth amendment, and desired Dr. Parker to report the same to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

This House then prepared alterations of the form of solemnization of matrimony, which were accordingly reported by their Secretary to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies returned to this House, by the Hon. Mr. Hopkinson, their amendments of the morning prayer and litany, with their concurrence in some articles, and non-concurrence in others.

This House prepared alterations of the order for the visitation of the sick, which were accordingly reported to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies returned to this House the proposed amendments of the selection of psalms, with their concurrence of some articles, and non-concurrence of others.

Adjourned till to-morrow at nine o'clock.

COLLEGE of Philadelphia, *Tuesday, October 13th, 1789.*

Divine service being over,

The House of Bishops proceeded to prepare—the order how the psalter is appointed to be read—the order how the rest of the holy scriptures is appointed to be read—and the order for the burial of the dead—which being prepared, were sent by the Secretary to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, together with a message, requesting a conference with that House on the amendments of the proposed morning prayer and litany, at such time, and in such manner, as they shall agree upon.

The House then proceeded to prepare a commination service, &c. when they received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by their Secretary, informing, that, agreeably to the request of this House, they had appointed five o'clock this afternoon for a conference on the proposed morning prayer and litany.

The room in which the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies meet was mutually agreed on, as most convenient for the business.

Adjourned till four o'clock this afternoon.

Four o'clock, P. M.

The House of Bishops received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Parker and the Rev. Dr. Moore, with information, that, if agreeable to this House, the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies would postpone the conference, agreed to be held this

afternoon, until further communication; with which this House concurred.

This House then prepared the form and manner of setting forth the psalms in metre, and sent the same, by their Secretary, to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies; together with the form of commination, &c. and tables of moveable and immoveable feasts, with tables for finding the holy days.

The House then received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Beach, with information, that they had to propose prayers and thanksgivings for several occasions; which were accordingly presented.

Adjourned till nine o'clock to morrow morning.

COLLEGE of Philadelphia, *Wednesday, October 14th, 1789.*

Divine service being over,

This House received a message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Parker, with amendments of the alterations of the burial service, originated in this House.

The amendments being concurred in, the alterations were passed, and returned.

This House then originated alterations of the services for private baptism, and for the baptism of adults, and sent the same, by their Secretary, to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.

A message from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Hon. Mr. Hopkinson, was received by this House, which accompanied amendments of the alterations of the marriage service, originated in this House; which amendments being concurred in, the alterations were passed, and returned.

This House received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies a proposed communion service, and made amendments.

Adjourned till four o'clock in the afternoon.

Four o'clock, P. M.

The House originated alterations of the catechism—of the order of confirmation—and a form of family prayer—and sent them to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, with the amendments of the communion service; which last were concurred in, except one, which being withdrawn by this House, the service was passed, and returned.

Adjourned till to-morrow morning, nine o'clock.

COLLEGE of Philadelphia, *Thursday, October 15th, 1789.*

Divine service being over,

This House had returned to them from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by the Rev. Dr. Parker, the order how the psalter is appointed to be read, and the order how the rest of the holy scripture is appointed to be read, with amendments; all of which were concurred

in, except one, which was left for the conference, into which the house now went, agreeably to a former appointment, and in which they were employed during the morning of this day.

Adjourned till four o'clock this afternoon.

Four o'clock, P. M.

This House originated, and proposed to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies—alterations of the title page—a form of ratification of the Book of Common Prayer—a table of contents—a form or manner of printing the former preface—and those called “Of the Service of the Church”—and “Of Ceremonies”—these, with the form of thanksgiving of women after child-birth, before prepared—and the amendments of the occasional prayers—were sent by the Secretary to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies; after which the two houses proceeded in their conference.

Adjourned till to-morrow morning, nine o'clock.

COLLEGE, Friday, October 16th, 1789.

Divine service being over,

This House received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, by Dr. Blackwell, canons, as reported by a committee appointed at the former session.

This House acceded to the Canons proposed, except the amendment of one, in consequence of which it was proposed to withdraw the canon, which being acceded to, this House passed the canons.

This House received, by Robert Andrews, Esq. the proposed order for evening prayer, of which they made an amendment, by proposing the insertion of two hymns, as alternatives to the psalms already in the service; which being agreed to, the order for evening prayer was passed.

The House received, by the Rev. Mr. Bend, a table of proper psalms; which was passed.

The House received, by the Rev. Dr. Beach and Robert Andrews, Esq. the table of contents, and the other initial parts of the book of common prayer, with a proposal, that they should be referred to a committee, to sit in the recess of this Convention; which was agreed to.

The House received, by the Rev. Mr. Ogden and Rev. Mr. Bend, amendments of the form of ratification of the book of common prayer, and also the form of churching of women, which are to lay over for consideration.

This House originated, and sent to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, as follow—a proposed ratification of the thirty-nine articles, with an exception in regard to the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh articles—a form for the communion of the sick—a form for the visitation of prisoners—a form for thanksgiving for the fruits of the earth—and prayers to be inserted in the visitation of the sick.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies returned, by the Rev. Mr. Bend, the proposed form of printing the psalms in metre, with hymns,

and proposed amendments of the same, which were agreed to, and the whole passed.

This House received, by the Rev. Mr. Bend, the visitation office and additional prayers, which being concurred in, the whole were passed; as was also the form of the ratification of the book of common prayer.

This House received, by Robert Andrews, Esq. the ratification of the articles, with a proposal for postponement, which was agreed to, the proposal for the communion of the sick being first presented and passed.

This House received, by the Rev. Mr. Bisset, a proposal for retaining the service for Ash-Wednesday, as in the proposed book, with one alteration, which was agreed to.

This House returned the occasional prayers, passed.

The House then passed the morning and evening prayer, the litany, the selection of the psalms, and the orders how the psalter and the rest of the holy scripture is appointed to be read.

Four o'clock, P. M.

The House received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, amendments of the catechism; which being agreed to, the service was passed.

This House returned to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, the office for the churching of women, and the occasional prayers, the amendments mutually proposed having been agreed to.

It is understood, that the services originated in this House, and not returned with amendments, have been agreed to.

This House received from the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, a message, informing, that they had appointed a committee, to join with any person to be appointed by this House, in setting forth the Book of Common Prayer. In consequence of which, the Right Reverend Bishop White agrees to assist the committee in preparing the book for publication.

The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies signified to this House, that they were about to adjourn, to meet, the next stated time, in the city of New York, having previously appointed a committee to act, if necessary, in their recess. On which this House adjourned to the same time and place.

Signed as the Journal of the Convention, the sixteenth day of October, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-nine.

SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D. Bishop of Connecticut, President.

WILLIAM WHITE, D. D. Pennsylvania.

Attested. JOSEPH CLARKSON, Secretary.

(To be continued.)

BOOK NOTICES.

THE HISTORY OF THE RELIGIOUS MOVEMENT OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY, CALLED METHODISM, considered in its different Denominational Forms, and its Relations to British and American Protestantism. By ABEL STEVENS, LL. D. Volume II. From the death of Whitefield to the death of Wesley. New York: Carlton & Porter. 8vo. pp. 520.

Dr. Stevens is writing his defense of Methodism with a good deal of adroitness. He is something of a rhetorician, and understands the *argumentum ad populum* pretty well. The miserable quirk with which, in his Newspaper—for, very conveniently, he is Editor as well as Author—he dodged our examination of his First Volume, is a fair specimen of the manner in which, in his History, he avoids the real difficulties of his subject. That there are such difficulties, he knows as well as we; insurmountable difficulties, and which are all the while leading many of the very best men among the Methodists back to that Church which neither John nor Charles Wesley ever deserted. The following are among Wesley's most solemn words, which we commend to the attention of Dr. Stevens, if he is really undertaking to write an honest and truthful "history" of the "Methodist Movement."

"Carefully avoid whatever has a tendency to separate men from the Church. O! use every means to prevent this. 1. Exhort all our people to keep close to the Church and Sacrament. 2. Warn them all against nicety in hearing—a prevailing evil. 3. Warn them also against despising the prayers of the Church. 4. Against calling our Society 'the Church.' 5. Against calling our preachers 'ministers,' our houses 'meeting houses;' call them plain preaching-houses, or chapels. But some may say, 'our own service is public worship.' Yes, but not such as supersedes the Church Service. If it were designed to be instead of the Church Service, it would be essentially defective, for it seldom has the four grand parts of Public Prayer, Deprecation, Petition, Intercession, and Thanksgiving. If the people put ours in the room of the Church Service, we hurt them that stay with us, and ruin them that leave us. *Let this be well observed: I fear, when the Methodists leave the Church, God will leave them.*"

In the last sermon he published, (1789,) within two years of his death, and more than four years after the "American Schism," of which we hear so much, he says:

"I hold all the doctrines of the Church of England. I love her Liturgy. I believe one reason why God is pleased to continue my life so long, is to confirm the Methodists in their present purpose not to separate from the Church."

And he exhorts them with the solemn emphasis of a dying man:

"Though ye have and will have a thousand temptations to leave it, and set up for yourselves, regard them not; be Church of England men still. Do not cast away the peculiar glory which God hath put upon you, and frustrate the design of Providence, the very end for which God hath raised you up. * * * Remember what I said, 'are we not unawares, by little and little, sliding into a separation from the Church? Oh, use every means to prevent this! Exhort all our people to keep close to the Church and Sacrament. How can you, how dare you suffer yourself to be called Bishop? I shudder, I start at the very thought! Men may call me a knave, or a fool, a rascal, a scoundrel, and I am content; but they shall never, by my consent, call me *Bishop!* For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put a full end to this! Let the Presbyterians do what they please, but let the Methodists know their calling better.'"^{*}

* Wesley's Works, Vol. VII, p. 188.

We observe that Dr. Stevens gives as a frontispiece of this volume a portrait of Charles Wesley! Does he mean that his readers shall infer from this that Charles Wesley, also, was a Methodist, in Dr. Stevens' acceptance of the term? If Dr. Stevens expects to quiet that earnest spirit of enquiry, which is more and more pervading the Methodist denomination, with such sophistry as he is elaborating in this work, he certainly will be disappointed.

NATURE AND THE SUPERNATURAL, AS TOGETHER CONSTITUTING THE ONE SYSTEM OF GOD. By HORACE BUSHNELL. Fourth Edition. New York: Charles Scribner. 1859. 8vo. pp. 528.

Since the publication of Dr. Bushnell's work entitled "GOD IN CHRIST" comprising his Three Discourses on "The Divinity of Christ," "The Atonement," and "Dogma and Spirit," which were delivered in 1848, at New Haven, Cambridge, and Andover, we have ceased to have the slightest confidence in, or to feel any very great respect for, anything which may come from Dr. Bushnell; and yet, in one way or another, he has kept pretty constantly before the public. For that work was nothing more or less than a revamping of the old Sabellian, or, more strictly, Paulian Heresy, disguised, somewhat, under a Mosaic gloss of Orthodox, Pantheistic, and Transcendental forms of expression. Portions of the work before us we have heard very highly commended, especially the Christological and Churchly elements, which are illustrated and brought out in it with great distinctness. And yet, both these elements are, after all, of the Bushnellian type and order. Rationalism is quite willing to have positive Doctrine and external Institutions; but it is careful, like Dr. Bellows and his new Unitarian Church and Liturgy, to have them in its own way, and after its own fashion; not as an original, authoritative, binding element of a Supernatural system, or of the Church of Christ and the Apostles.

Dr. Bushnell, as we see in the volume before us, has discovered that "the personality of Satan" is simply a mistake, a theological error; that there is no such person; though he has not, we believe, got as far yet as the Rev. Dr. Donaldson, of Cambridge University, who has found out that the whole doctrine of angels, as "intermediate intelligences" between the Creator and man, was learned by the Jews of the heathen nations during the Babylonian Captivity!

Dr. Bushnell's theory of the *origin of evil* falls in very naturally with his notion of the character of Satan. His theory we regard as no more orthodox, and much more dangerous, than the *pre-existent* theory of Beecher. According to Dr. Bushnell, sin is not only a *necessity* in the disciplinary process of man's moral being, but, on the whole, a very good sort of thing; inasmuch as it will conduce to the highest perfection of that being. Even the good angels, he says, "for aught that appears, have all been passed through and brought up out of a fall, *as the redeemed of mankind will be.*" We have italicised these words, and the reader will see what Dr. Bushnell may be supposed as aiming to teach in them.

But we shall not review the book. Indeed, we did not intend to touch it. We fully agree with Bishop Burgess, that the book is "one of the most adventurous, and the crudest, which our age and country have originated." We freely confess that we are sick of all this rigmarole, and have no patience with it. Churchmen, especially, have in an age like this, truths and duties claiming their attention, instead of chasing this *ignis fatuus*, this *will-o'-the-wisp* of modern speculation. What it has of truth, is better taught elsewhere. Its errors we certainly can dispense with; while its habits of thought and methods of reasoning are both the creature and creator of mere will-worship.

THE TYPES OF GENESIS, briefly considered as revealing the development of Human Nature in the world within and without, and in the Dispensations. By ANDREW JUKES. London. 1858.

The basis of exposition in this volume, is, in the main, that contained in the old, and, in one clause at least, mischievous couplet :

"Litera gesta docet; quod credas allegoria;
Moralis quod agas; quo tendas anagogia."

The extent to which this principle of a mystic sense is carried, is shown in these words of the writer: "Genesis then reveals to us all that can spring out of Adam. In the letter, it gives us the story of Adam and his sons. In spirit, we may learn how old Adam behaves, what the old man is in each of us," &c.

It is impossible for a person of pious and cultivated mind, and such is our author, to dwell in this way on Holy Scripture, without producing much that is edifying and instructive. Neither can we expect all persons to be agreed as to the extent of the typology and spiritual signification of the Old Testament Scriptures.

Still, while we do not at all hold the principle, the fallacy of which Dr. Fairbairn has so well exposed, that there are no types but those expressly declared to be so in the New Testament; and while we entirely respect the author's spirit and purposes, we cannot but think his work dangerous in some respects to believers, and putting, in others, weapons into the hands of infidels.

THE HEROES OF THE LAST LUSTRE. A Poem. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr. 1858.

The author of this graceful little poem does not believe that the heroic either has died out in the world, or is likely to do so. Wherever he finds a man who recognizes "the moral grandeur of duty performed," there he finds a hero. He says:

"Dream not of glories of the days of yore—
Not all the day is sped,
Thy sun gleams overhead,
In the bright hollow of the evermore."

And again:

"Oh say not that the martyr spirit's dead!
Or that the hero heart
Will e'er from earth depart,
Or we shall ever weep true manhood fled."

This has the true ring, and we welcome it heartily. For we are inclined to think there is more cant just now about heroes and heroism, than about most other things. Some treat the hero as a fossil remains of ages long gone by. Others, and we like them least, make him out what the Boston merchant described the transcendentalist, "one of those men who have soarings after the infinite, and divings after the unfathomable, but who never pay cash."

Now, we believe that there is always found in the true hero, and we trace it from Achilles down, an abiding basis of common sense, practical tact, and straight forward resolution. Perhaps we must beg pardon of the school-boys and school-girls, but we do believe it, and our author does, too.

So he selects as types of the heroism of the age, the heroes of the Arctic Expedition, of the Crimean War, and of the Norfolk Pestilence. The selection seems to us a significant one. For though the heroic spirit is ever the same, it develops itself in new forms. But the old spirit is here; that spirit which from the plains of Shinar has driven men over the world, not for conquest only, nor yet for gain, but for adventure and knowledge; that spirit which lives in the immortal verse of the Iliad, and in many another lay since then; that spirit which only Christianity brings to its full life and stature, which "lays

down its life for its friend," and finds a friend in every son of Adam. Franklin, Vicars, Nightingale, Chisholm, in these our author brings us noble examples of what he, and we with him, regard as the truly heroic.

The Poem is well worked out. We trace in it, indeed, something of the "*copia superabundans*," but that is a good fault. It is easier to trim off the branches of a too luxuriant growth, than to bring growth out of a barren stock. There is exhibited in it, it seems to us, great power of versification. Indeed, if we were to enter any caveat here, it would be, that ease should not be allowed to degenerate into that "fatal facility" which so soon wears itself out.

We commend the Poem to our readers, feeling sure that they will rise from its perusal both pleased and profited, and desiring to meet the author again in the field of letters. His wish, so modestly expressed in his concluding note, will, we are confident, be more than fulfilled.

The volume is dedicated by a son to the memory of a father. And when we say that that father was the late Rev. Flavel Mines, we know many hearts will feel that not filial piety alone can speak of him as "a valiant soldier of the Cross, who fell on the field during the last Lustre."

THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND ON CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION.

By the Rev. JOSEPH BARDSLEY, M. A., Incumbent of St. Silas, Liverpool.
London: Hatchard & Co. 1859. pp. 55.

This is a paper read before the "Liverpool Clerical Society," in November last, and published at their request. It is written with care, and a full understanding of the subject, and seems to have been drawn forth by a work of the Rev. WILLIAM GRESLEY, entitled "The Ordinance of Confession;" a work recommending and defending the "*Ordinance*," not for special and exceptional cases only, but for general use, and as a privilege afforded by the Church of England to her Lay members. The historical question is thoroughly examined in this pamphlet, and many of the authorities cited by Mr. Gresley, in support of his peculiar views, are shown to have been unfairly quoted, and to be, in their integrity, against the whole practice of Auricular Confession. We have no patience with these men whose sympathies are with Rome, and who seek to introduce the Romish Confessional, or something like it, into the Church of which they are Ministers. Mr. Gresley, as well as Dr. Pusey, on this question and others of equal importance, has undoubtedly abandoned the impregnable ground, Primitive and Apostolic usage, on which Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Jewell, and other eminent divines of the Reformation stood, in defending the "Faith once delivered to the Saints."

The pamphlet of Mr. Bardsley will do good. It is learned, lucid, and logical, and imbued with the true Christian spirit. This is his conclusion:

"In answer to the question, 'What is the teaching of the Church of England on Confession and Absolution?' I am satisfied that a correct reply will be found in the resolution which was passed at the meeting last Friday evening:

"That while we recognize humble and penitent confession of our sins before God, as an essential part of our Christian worship; and hail with thankfulness the authoritative declaration of our Ministers, that Almighty God pardons and absolves all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel; and while we rejoice in the privilege of consulting our Ministers concerning what may at any time perplex our minds and wound our consciences, we are at the same time fully assured, and desire to give unequivocal expression to our conviction, that Auricular Confession, as formerly practised in this realm, or as recently introduced by a few mistaken Clergymen, has no real foundation in the standards of the Church of England."

THEODORE PARKER'S EXPERIENCE AS A MINISTER, with some Account of his Early Life and Education for the Ministry. Contained in a Letter from him to the Members of the Twenty-Eighth Congregational Society of Boston. Boston: Rufus Leighton, Jr. 8vo. pp. 182. 1859.

We have so thoroughly and so recently examined the views of Theodore Parker, that we do not care to take him up again so soon. It is an odious subject. We always feel as if we had been touching pitch, after reading him. Early in the present year he was "attacked with bleeding in the lungs or throat," and compelled to seek a more genial clime. A Letter of sympathy from members of his Society in Boston, was the occasion of the "Letter," which was written at Santa Cruz, and forms most of the present volume. It is his own rehearsal of his own life. It is full of self-conceit, self-laudation, blasphemy against God, hatred of the Bible and the Church; it is, in a word, a resumé of Parkerism; and yet, there is in it an abyss of unbelief which makes one's soul shudder. This whole matter is utterly unworthy of our attention, except for one single reason. There is, in the way of argument, nothing new in anything that Theodore Parker has said or written. He has only said and written old things in new places; and how he has come to say and write these old things in these new places—this is the problem for men to solve. Yet there is no mystery in it. Theodore Parker is the natural outgrowth of Puritanic Calvinism developed under the influence of German infidel speculation; that is, it is New England Puritanism Germanized. We find a single passage in this Letter which contains such an epitome of Parkerism that it is worth quoting. "All the six great historic forms of religion, the Brahmanic, Hebrew, Classic, Buddhistic, Christian, Mohammedan, profess to have come miraculously from God, not normally from man; and, spite of the excellence which they contain, and the vast service the humblest of them has done, yet each must ere long prove a hindrance to human welfare, for it claims to be a Finality, and makes the whole of human nature wait upon an accident of human History; and that accident, the whim of some single man. The Absolute Religion which belongs to man's nature, and is gradually unfolded thence, like the high achievements of art, science, literature, and politics, is only distinctly conceived of in an advanced stage of man's growth. To make its idea a Fact, is the highest triumph of the Human Race."

This is Parkerism; yet it is vastly like a great deal of stuff which comes to us from more orthodox quarters. It may be well to mention, that in this Letter Theodore Parker acknowledges the sympathy which he has received in the utterance of his sentiments, from Greeley's *Tribune*, and the *Evening Post*.

THE GREEK TESTAMENT: With a Critically Revised Text; A Digest of Various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; Prolegomena; and a Critical and Exegetical Commentary. For the Use of Theological Students and Ministers. By HENRY ALFORD, B. D., Minister of Quebec Chapel, London, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In four Volumes. Vol. I. Containing the Four Gospels. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 8vo. pp. 835. New Haven: E. Downes.

We have on hand an Article discussing pretty thoroughly, this large, and, in several respects, very important work, which we shall publish in an early No. of the Review.

THE NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPEDIA. A Popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by GEORGE RIFLEY and CHARLES A. DANA. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1859. 8vo. Vol. VI. Cough—Education. pp. 772.

This New American Cyclopaedia has advanced far enough in its publication to show that it is not one of the catch-penny publications of the day. Its Articles

on Physical Science and the Useful Arts, in which our age is advancing with rapid strides, are carefully written, and cover the very latest discoveries and improvements. Its Biographical Sketches, both of the living and the dead, are numerous; and the work, when completed, will be the best Biographical Dictionary extant. The Author of the sketches of Oliver Cromwell and of Archbishop Cranmer, however, should never have written them for such a work; for Cromwell is white-washed after the ultra-Puritan fashion; and the portrait of Cranmer is but a daub. The writer has no just conceptions of the great principles at issue in those troublous times. We observe, also, that in speaking of the doctrines of Popery, the most sectarian of all the sects, he uses the terms "Catholic," &c. It is time such nonsense were done away even in the penny papers of the day; but in an American Cyclopaedia, such language is unpardonable.

LECTURES ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN ENGLAND, with Sermons; by THOMAS WINTHROP COIT, D. D., LL. D., Rector of St. Paul's Church, Troy, New York. Daniel Dana, Junior, 381 Broadway, New York. 1859. 12mo. pp. 334.

The circumstances under which these Sermons and Lectures have been published, are as creditable to the Author as the Volume itself. Last Christmas day, a subscription list, to meet the expense of such a publication, was handed to Dr. Coit, as a Christmas gift on the part of his parishioners; and it was therefore proper that a selection from his Sermons should appear in such a Memorial; but we suggest to these parishioners and to the publishers, that they cannot now do the Church, or the author, a greater service, than to publish the Lectures in a separate volume, at the cheapest possible price, and to scatter them freely all over the Church. One of the Sermons, on "The Standard of Appeal on doubtful points, where the Bible fails to produce Unity," might well be included in the volume. This would make just such a work as the Church needs.

The Lectures, five in number, are on the following subjects:

I. Christianity in Britain derived from the East, and not from the West. As old in Britain as in Italy.

II. Sketch of the Christian History of Britain, to the Invasion of Pagan Saxons, and the retreat of the Christian Britons into Wales and Cornwall.

III. The Italian Mission of Gregory the First, to East England, at the close of the Sixth Century—its motives and early fortunes.

IV. Bearing of the New Religion from Rome towards the Old Christianity which it encountered in the British Isles.

V. Means by which Romanism intruded and fastened itself upon the British Isles.—Proof that it was not the principal means of converting the Pagans there, and was not at all necessary for converting them.

It will be seen that the Lectures cover an important point in the controversy between us and Rome; and the Author's plain English and racy style, which are only the expression of his clear and definite conceptions, leave the reader in no doubt as to the strength and point of the argument. On half a dozen points in the "Early History of Christianity in England," our own reading has not led us to precisely the same statement of opinion with the learned Author; but these are only upon incidental matters. The conclusion to which Dr. Coit comes, as the result of his careful investigation, is this: "All this goes to demonstrate, (*to demonstrate* is my phrase, because the proof is cumulative and irresistible, like that of a proposition in mathematics,) that the old Church of England was no child of Rome—had nothing whatever to do with Rome's paternity, or relationship, or wardship—but *was* as independent, and *had been* as independent, as providential circumstances and untrammelled Christian liberty could make her." Dr. Coit is right in saying that "demonstrate" is the word. The man who will doubt the above proposition will doubt whether $2+2=4$; or whether the whole is greater than a part. There is no room for doubt. And the pretension of Rome in this matter is an outrageous insult to the intelligence of the man to whom she makes

it. The copious foot-notes to the Lectures, which exhibit the thoroughness of Dr. Coit's reading and his rare accuracy, will, by many, be regarded as not the least valuable portion of the volume.

TRACTS FOR MISSIONARY USE. Edited by the Author of "Letters to a Man bewildered among many Counselors." Two Volumes. 12mo. New York: Daniel Dana, Jr. 1859. pp. 262, 246.

These two volumes contain twenty-two Tracts; three of which were written by the Right Rev. Bishop Cobbs, D. D., of Alabama; one, by Bishop Atkinson, D. D., of North Carolina; one, by a Lady; one, by the Author of "Beattie Melville;" and the remaining sixteen, by the Rev. Dr. Lay, of Huntsville, Ala.

In the warfare of the Church Militant, our weapons must be adapted to the new positions, defenses, and methods of the enemy. In each age, error, whether doctrinal or practical, while essentially unchanged, does, notwithstanding, change its outward forms, puts on new disguises, has its new modes of attack. Hence it is, that new modes of illustration, not new arguments, are called for; and the man who has the knowledge of human nature, and the tact to reach the popular mind and heart through some story like "The Dairyman's Daughter," has the talent for eminent usefulness. It is these "small arms" of the Church which we are in danger of forgetting; just as a preacher may attain great eminence as a mere preacher, and yet, after all, spend his life almost in vain. Dr. Lay has this rare gift in a high degree. Some of these little stories, which reveal the inner struggle of one in doubt and difficulty in the Christian life, are worth more, in their way, than a ponderous folio; and we assure those of our faithful Clergy who, in their ceaseless, unostentatious round of parish duty, are making up their jewels for the last great day, that they will find something to aid them in one or another of these diversified and beautifully written Tracts. They are Churchly in their tone and teaching; and, at the same time, there is in them all, a vein of deep spirituality.

They are published separately, and at a trifling cost.

COSMOS: A Sketch of a Physical Description of the Universe. By ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT. Translated from the German by E. C. OTTE, and W. S. DALLAR, F. L. S. Volume Fifth. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 12mo. pp. 462. New Haven: E. Downes.

This last volume completes a work which contains the results of Humboldt's observations in the whole field of Physical Science. The present volume is devoted wholly to telluric phenomena. The first section treats of Size, Form, and Density of the Earth, its Internal Heat and Magnetic Activity, considered with regard to its intensity, Inclination, Declination, and Polar Light. The second section treats of the reaction of the interior of the earth upon its surface, as exhibited in thermal, gas, and naphtha Springs; Volcanoes, their localities, number, phenomena, &c., &c. The whole work contains a vast fund of information, and, as a source of accurate information for thorough reading and constant reference, it is invaluable.

LIVES OF THE QUEENS OF SCOTLAND AND ENGLISH PRINCESSES CONNECTED WITH THE REGAL SUCCESSION OF GREAT BRITAIN. By AGNES STRICKLAND. Vol. VIII. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 12mo. pp. 379. New Haven: E. Downes.

With the present volume the second series of these royal biographies is brought to a close. It contains the lives of Elizabeth Stuart, afterward Queen of Bohemia, and of her daughter, Sophia, Electress of Hanover, whose eldest son was George I. The biography of the Princess Sophia has drawn out all the graphic beauties of Miss Strickland's pen. She was a woman of rare beauty, and intellectual and moral strength and culture. She spoke five languages, and she was the protector of Leibnitz, and of other learned men. The whole series now concluded, is well fitted for a course of reading on this portion of European history.

Notwithstanding the strong partisan bias running through the volumes, and occasional instances of careless composition, the whole work is a valuable contribution to our historical literature.

ANTHON'S CICERO DE OFFICIIS. M. T. Ciceronis de Officiis Libri Tres. With Marginal Analysis and an English Commentary. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press, by the Rev. HUBERT ASHTON HOLDEN, M. A., Vice Principal of Cheltenham College, late Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. First American Edition, Corrected and Enlarged, by CHARLES ANTHON, LL. D., Professor of Greek in Columbia College. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 12mo. pp. 315. New Haven: E. Downes.

The text of this edition is that used in the best English Schools and in the University course. The Marginal Analysis is a valuable feature of this edition; and the Commentary has been much enlarged by Prof. Anthon, whose object has been to present the American student with a good *Variorum* edition, containing every thing necessary to clear up the difficulties of the original.

THE PASHA PAPERS. Epistles of Mohammed Pasha, Rear Admiral of the Turkish Navy, written from New York to his Friend Abel Ben Hassan. Translated into Anglo-American from the Original Manuscripts. To which are added sundry other letters, critical and explanatory, laudatory and oburgatory, from gratified or injured individuals in various parts of the planet. New York: Charles Scribner. 1859. 12mo. pp. 312.

These "Papers" are said to be from the pen of William Wirt Howe, Esq., a lawyer of New York city, and first appeared in one of the daily papers. They are written in a sort of mock-heroic, grandiloquent, oriental style, and are intended as a satire on the follies of American institutions, manners, customs, men, poets, orators, politicians, courts, &c., &c. The book seems to be an imitation of the Bigelow Papers of Professor Lowell, and the Potiphar Papers of G. W. Curtis. The provincial conceit of a certain little clique at Boston, the cockneyism of New York Snobocracy, the popular doctrine of Manifest Destiny, &c., &c., are, undoubtedly, fair game for the shafts of irony; but it needs more trenchant wit to save a whole volume of such reading from being insufferably tedious, though, as a series of newspaper articles, the "Papers" attracted some attention.

THE POET PREACHER. A brief Memorial of CHARLES WESLEY, the eminent Preacher and Poet. By CHARLES ADAMS. Five Illustrations. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1859. 12mo. pp. 234.

We thank the publishers for this brief Memorial of Charles Wesley. It does no injustice to his character as a true and loyal son of the Church of England, in whose communion he lived and died. We commend the volume as a good one for Sunday School Libraries.

A COMMENTARY, EXPLANATORY, DOCTRINAL AND PRACTICAL, ON THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. By R. E. PATTISON, D. D., late President of Waterville College. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859. 12mo. pp. 244.

While all Scripture is "profitable for doctrine," &c., yet of the shorter Epistles, none contains so complete a summary of Christian Doctrine and Duty as St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. The Author of the Commentary before us is ecclesiastically a Congregationalist, doctrinally a moderate Calvinist. The work shows the Author to be a man of orthodox views on several of the vital doctrines of the Gospel, as the Trinity, the Atonement, &c., but not a man well read in polemic theology. Thus that famous passage, "On this rock will I build my Church," he regards as referring to the individual Apostle, St. Peter; a construction unwarranted by the text, as the Author ought to have known, and rejected by the best interpreters, ancient and modern. The Author says, "the work is not designed for the learned." We do not commend it as a work adapted to all the wants of the unlearned.

ULTIMATE OBJECTS OF NAPOLEON III. A Pamphlet considering the Future in view of the Past, and judging it by the light of the Present. By M. HENRI ST. BERNARDE. Boston: Mansfield & Co. 1859. 16mo. pp. 61.

The "ultimate objects of Napoleon III" are supposed, by M. Bernarde, to be, "vengeance upon Britain, and her forcible, unquestionable humiliation. Vengeance for Waterloo, for Paris captured, and for St. Helena." What the "ultimate objects" of Napoleon III may be, we think of much less importance than the part which he is evidently made to play in the hand of a Power much greater than his own. The little pamphlet before us does not seem deserving of much attention. Louis Napoleon is not stupid enough to entertain any such proposition just now; and yet Lord Lyndhurst's Speech in Parliament, and the tone of the English press, are enough to prove the terror which the Emperor's name is able to inspire in England. We may, perhaps, in this place, with propriety allude to a most sensible and noble Speech of Mr. Gladstone, in the British Parliament, on the evening of August 8th. It proves him to be one of the first of British orators, and the best of British statesmen. We commend the speech to our readers. We rejoice that there is an English Churchman capable of making such a speech, on such an occasion, on the affairs of Central Italy.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1789, as viewed in the light of Republican Institutions. By JOHN S. C. ABBOTT. With One Hundred Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 8vo. pp. 439. New Haven: E. Downes.

Whatever it is that is necessary to make a capital story-teller, that Mr. Abbott has to a greater degree than most writers. How much of embellishment, and how much of strict historical fidelity, there is in his story, is quite another question; and as long as the public buy such books and pay for them, perhaps there is not much use in asking the question. The French Revolution of 1789, is a good story to tell; and Mr. Abbott is not mistaken in the general causes which he assigns for that event. Were he less of a Bonapartist than he is, he would find in those same causes the only apology possible for the wholesale massacres, the cold-blooded tyrannies, the wanton inflictions, and perjured villainies which have marked the career alike of Napoleon I, and Napoleon III. The least that can be said of them, is, that they are God's awful judgments with which He scourges an unrighteous people. They are the price of national infidelity. We need not say of Mr. Abbott's book that it is readable, and that it will doubtless have a large sale.

ANCIENT MINERALOGY; or an Enquiry respecting Mineral Substances mentioned by the Ancients. With Occasional Remarks on the uses to which they were applied. By N. F. MOORE, LL. D. Second Edition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 12mo. pp. 250. New Haven: E. Downes.

Dr. Moore's "Ancient Mineralogy" is a very curious, and, in some respects, an instructive book. His pursuits, as Professor of Greek and Latin in Columbia College, made him familiar with all that the ancients wrote on a subject which his own natural taste invested with the charm of interest. As the result of Prof. Moore's investigations, it appears that, comparatively, we greatly overrate our own knowledge of Mineralogy, and underrate that of the ancients. If they lacked classification and systematic arrangement, yet in knowledge of the properties and many of the uses of many mineral substances, and in their conception of the beautiful, the ancients have not been surpassed in modern times. Theophrastus and Pliny both wrote on Minerals, and the work of the latter is made the basis of Prof. Moore's volume. Another pleasing feature of this work, is the Author's examination of all the "Mineral Substances mentioned in the Bible." The Author concludes by endorsing the sentiment of Sir H. Davy, "that the ancients were in all pursuits, which require only the native powers of the intellect or the refinements of taste, preëminent; that their literature and

their works of art offer models which have never been excelled; that they possessed, as if instinctively, the perception of everything beautiful, grand, and decorous; and that, as natural philosophers, they failed, not from want of genius and application, but merely because they followed a mistaken path."

We will not fail to add, here, that how far the Inductive Method is really based on true scientific principles, and how much it has added to our real knowledge, is, after all, a good deal more of a question than it is generally thought to be.

RAMBLES AMONG WORDS: Their Poetry, History, and Wisdom. By WILLIAM SWINTON. New York: Charles Scribner. 1859. 12mo. pp. 302.

As an illustration of the English Language, its history, growth, philosophy, corruptions, &c., the work of Mr. Swinton is better adapted to the use of American students than any as yet published. It has been prepared with the labors of Trench, Horne Tooke, Pegge, Nares, and others, in view; and yet, of the fifteen hundred words which the "Rambles" illustrate, the large majority have not before been used in the way of etymologic translation.

The following, from "Ramble Eleventh," on the "Growth of Words," is a good specimen of the Author:

"The causes of that marvelous identity we call the English Language, lie deep in the manifold influences that have made the English nation. The History of a Language is measurable only in the terms of all the factors that have shaped a people's life. A nation's history is the result of the double action of internal impulses and external events. And Language expresses the infusions from all these—subtly absorbing the ethnology of a nation, its geography, government, traditions, culture, faith. Shooting its deep tap-root into eldest antiquity, drawing from the pith and sap of that grandest of all families of races and tongues—the Indo-European stock; receiving living grafts from France, and Italy, and Scandinavia, this divine tree of the English Speech has grown up into its sublime proportions, nurtured by the history of a thousand years.

"Of this superb Speech—the grandest in the world—we have no adequate treatment. There is no history of the English Language. Nor any Dictionary of the English Language. We have no such work on the English Language as the Germans possess in the 'Teutonic Grammar' of Jacob Grimm, who has, with masterly method and largest appreciation of modern Philology, traced the formative influences of the German speech, as it has shaped itself into conscious individuality."

HOURS WITH MY PUPILS; or Educational Addresses, etc. The Young Lady's Guide, and Parents' and Teachers' Assistant. By MRS. LINCOLN PHELPS, late Principal of Patapsco Institute, of Maryland. New York: Charles Scribner. 1859. 12mo. pp. 363.

Mrs. Phelps' marked success through a long course of years, as an educator, did not depend merely on her facility in imparting literary instruction. Education, in its true sense, means more than this. It means not only the head, the intellect; it means the heart, manners, opinions, views of life, present and future. The Addresses of which this volume is composed were delivered weekly in presence of her teachers and pupils, by Mrs. Phelps. They are worthy of being repeated by other teachers, and of being read widely. We notice incidentally mentioned in the volume, an exhibition of Miss Martineau's character, which does not surprise us. Miss Martineau, besides being a charlatan and a quack in her social theories, it seems, in her manners and feelings is not even a lady.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, and the Final Condition of the Wicked, Carefully Considered. By ROBERT W. LANDIS. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1859. 12mo. pp. 518.

The "old foes with new faces," by whom the Faith in our times is so strenuously assailed, are calling forth defenders of all sorts, good, bad, and indifferent. We have not, in twenty years, seen a really new objection against, or argument for the Gospel of CHRIST. Mr. Landis, in the volume before us, attempts a refutation, not only of modern Materialists and Annihilators, but of Deism, Socinianism, Rationalism, &c., &c., in all their protean forms. The work is rather a summary of facts, statements and opinions, than a clear and compact argument.

THE LIFE OF GENERAL HAVELOCK, K. C. B. By J. T. HEADLEY, Author of "Napoleon and his Marshals," etc. Illustrated. New York: C. Scribner. 1859. 12mo. pp. 375.

The hero of Lucknow, the valiant soldier, the bold and chivalric leader, and yet the humble Christian, is a theme full of interest, and Mr. Headley has succeeded in making out of it an entertaining volume, notwithstanding its latitudinarian tone and tendency. The style of Mr. Headley, which is of the "spread eagle" sort, we do not admire.

THE CONVALESCENT. By N. PARKER WILLIS. New York: Charles Scribner. 1859. 12mo. pp. 456.

Mr. Willis is too well known to need any introduction to our readers. The present volume is made up of jaunty, sketchy-Letters first contributed to "THE HOME JOURNAL," from Idlewild, Nantucket, and Virginia. The author has seen enough of the world to appreciate the coarse, self-satisfied vulgarity, the impudent snobism of our American Aristocracy, and the elements of future greatness which enter into the warp and woof of American character.

SIGHT AND HEARING; How Preserved and How Lost. By J. HENRY CLARK, M. D. Fifth Thousand, carefully revised. With an Index. New York: C. Scribner. 1859. 12mo. pp. 351.

A sensible book for popular use, on the Eye and the Ear, their structure, abuse, diseases, loss of power, remedies, &c.

THE ART OF EXTEMPORE SPEAKING: Hints for the Pulpit, the Senate, and the Bar. By M. BAUTAIN, Vicar-General and Professor at the Sorbonne, etc., etc. With Additions by a Member of the New York Bar. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand Street. 1859. 12mo. pp. 364.

A really good treatise on Extempore Speaking, by one who knows its difficulties and its true method, who can sympathize with the preacher in all his embarrassment, and teach him how to attain success in this great Art—such a work is this, from the eloquent M. Bautain. His suggestions on the Selection and Division of the subject, the Preparation of the Plan of the Discourse, the Arrangement of the Plan, Preparation before Speaking, the Exordium, the Development, the Peroration, &c. are minute and sensible. If our Clergy would thoroughly study this work, and follow its teachings, they would develop powers of usefulness which would surprise both themselves and their congregations. If the "Pulpit is losing its hold on the public mind," as is sometimes said, so far as the Clergy of the Church are concerned, the neglect of Extempore Speaking is one principal cause, though it is not the only one.

The following is the substance of the author's direction, as to the manner of preparation:

"When there is time for preparation, never undertake to speak without having put on paper the frame of what you have to say, the links of your ideas. Do this the moment you feel your idea matured, following your inspiration to the end; after which, let things alone for a little season. Then read it over and amend it, so as to render the principal features well marked, and the divisions of the discourse clear, and the links firmly wielded. Leave nothing obscure, doubtful, or vague: and admit no feature which does not indicate something of importance. Then, the last thing before speaking, let it be reviewed; gather up the energies and hold them in the spring and direction whither they are to flow. But reliance must not be placed on the notes to keep from breaking down. Having prepared to the best of your ability, allow yourself, filled with the subject, to be borne along by the current of your ideas, letting the heart, rather than the memory, give the tongue its utterance."

THE HISTORY OF A POCKET PRAYER BOOK, WRITTEN BY ITSELF. Fifth Edition, revised and enlarged. Philadelphia: Burns & Sieg. 1859. 18mo. pp. 262.

Aside from the clever and entertaining manner in which Dr. Dorr has told the story of a Pocket Prayer Book, the great secret of the usefulness of this little volume, is in the fact that most of the scenes and incidents recorded were occurrences of actual life; and were connected with the experiences of such men as Dr. Johnson, Father Nash, Bishop Hobart, and others like them in earnestness of character. It is a little volume that cannot fail to awaken interest and remove prejudices concerning the Church, and should be found in every Parish and Sunday School Library.

THE ORIGIN AND COMPILATION OF THE PRAYER BOOK, with an Appendix, containing various Historical Facts and Documents connected with our Liturgy. By Rev. W. H. ODENHEIMER, D. D. Fourth Edition, enlarged. Philadelphia: Burns & Sieg. 1859. 18mo. pp. 128.

A good History of the Prayer Book is its best commentary; and the little work of Dr. Odenheimer, while it contains information, facts, and documents, which can be gleaned only from a large library, is also an unanswerable argument for our own branch of Christ's One, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

THE WARS OF THE ROSES; or, Stories of the Struggle of York and Lancaster. By J. G. EDGAR, Author of "The Boyhood of Great Men," "The Footprints of Famous Men," &c. With Illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 16mo. pp. 470. New Haven: E. Downes.

No period of English History has in it more of romance than that embraced in this little volume. It was a struggle of thirty years between York and Lancaster, which cost a hundred thousand lives, emasculated the old nobility, and utterly destroyed the House of Plantagenet, and which ended at last in the marriage of Henry Tudor with Elizabeth of York, celebrated by poets and chroniclers as the "Union of the two Roses,"—a "spurious prince" with an "illegitimate daughter." The story is told in a manner to attract the young, for whom especially the book was written.

SCIENCE AND ART OF CHESS. By J. MONROE, B. C. L. New York: Charles Scribner. 1859. 12mo. pp. 281.

Whether the Boston "Mutual Admiration Society" did or did not make themselves ridiculous in their ado over Paul Morphy, yet that the Game of Chess is both a Science and an Art is taken for granted, and is sufficiently illustrated by Mr. Monroe, in the volume before us.

MY SISTER MARGARET. A Temperance Story. By Mrs. C. M. EDWARDS. Four Illustrations. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1859. 12mo. pp. 328.

THE MOTHER'S MISSION. Sketches from Real Life. By the Author of "The Object of Life." Five Illustrations. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1859. 12mo. pp. 311.

THE LORD'S SUPPER. By Rev. SAMUEL LUCKEY, D. D. With an Introduction by Rev. Bishop JAMES, (Methodist.) New York: Carlton & Porter. 1859. 12mo. pp. 284.

The above three volumes are published by the Methodist house in New York, and are all written in the spirit and interests of that denomination.

JOHN HALIFAX, GENTLEMAN. A new and illustrated edition. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 12mo. pp. 485. New Haven: E. Downes.

WALTER THORNLEY; or, A Peep at the Past. By the Author of "Allen Prescott." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 12mo. pp. 486. New Haven: E. Downes.

THE BERTHAMS. A Novel. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1859. 12mo. pp. 528. New Haven: E. Downes.

THOMSON'S FIRST LESSONS. Mental Arithmetic. 12mo. pp. 120.

ARITHMETICAL ANALYSIS; or Higher Mental Arithmetic for Advanced Classes. 12mo. pp. 192.

PRACTICAL ARITHMETIC, Uniting the Inductive with the Synthetic mode of Instruction, for Schools and Colleges. 12mo. pp. 384.

HIGHER ARITHMETIC; or the Science and Application of Numbers; Combining the Analytic and Synthetic Modes of Instruction. Designed for advanced classes in Schools and Academies. 12mo. pp. 422.

These four volumes form what is called "Day and Thomson's Mathematical Series" of School Books, commencing with the elementary principles, and covering "a full development of the philosophy of Arithmetic and its various applications to commercial purposes." The success of the work—one of the editions before us is the *one hundred and twentieth*, and another the *one hundred and twenty-fifth*—is enough to show that it has solid merits and is adapted to the popular wants of our Schools.

The Author is JAMES B. THOMSON, LL. D.; and the Publishers, Ivison & Phinney, New York.

GEOGRAPHY FOR PRIMARY SCHOOLS ON THE TRUE METHOD. By WORTHINGTON HOOKER, M. D. New Haven: Peck, White & Peck. 1859. 12mo. pp. 144.

The Author's "true method" is this—"what the child is already familiar with is made the basis of the extension of his knowledge."

THREE CONGREGATIONAL SERMONS. 1. "Congregationalism;" preached in the Plymouth Church of St. Paul, Minn., March 20th, 1859. By BURDETT HART, of Fair Haven, Conn.

2. "The Fast of Nineveh and the Fast of Connecticut;" preached in Enfield, Conn., April 22d, 1859. By C. A. G. BRIGHAM.

3. "A Plea for Union of the Evangelical Church." By Rev. L. BRIDGMAN, Pastor of the Congregational Church of Middlefield, Mass.

We have grouped these three Sermons together, as being three distinct portraits of three distinct phases of Congregationalism, at the present day. They are all cleverly done in their way; that is, they are all plain and outspoken; neither of the Preachers has dodged the points at issue, or hesitated to call things by what he thinks are their right names. Yet the Sermons are thoroughly unlike each other, in aim, sentiment, tone, and opinion. The first Preacher named, Mr. Burdett Hart, has before this, signalized himself by an attack on the Church in gener-

al, and Liturgies in particular; in which he showed himself to be a very small man, but very pugnacious; a very porcupine, bristling all over with very sharp weapons, yet extremely harmless. His Sermon at St. Paul was designed to push the Congregational element among the ultra-protestants at the Northwest; and a greater mass of reckless assertion, historical perversion, doctrinal radicalism, ecclesiastical vandalism, and stupid impudence, we have never met with in so small a compass. Every page, and almost every sentence, is open to attack; but really "the game is not worth the powder."

The second Sermon, by Mr. Brigham, is a *jeremiad* over the waning power, the loss of *caste*, influence, and position, on the part of Congregationalism in good old Connecticut. The occasion of this tirade, was the fact that the Governor had appointed the late State Fast on Good Friday; which fact, we confess, taken in connection with the old Puritan Laws on such matters, is somewhat ominous. But if one-half that the Preacher says as to the decline, both in doctrine and in morals, among the descendants of the Puritans is true, we have an argument for our own Diocesan Missions, which Churchmen ought not to disregard. He says, "the Church is large in the number of her membership, but her moral influence against such things is a mere cipher. She winks at these vices, rather than rebukes them. Her converts are daily multiplying, but her moral power is declining. * * * The new doctrines which promised to impart such a purity of life, have gone to seed in the vices which deface the appearance of society," &c., &c., &c. Aside, however, from the sad degeneracy of old fashioned Calvinistic Puritanism, this "Good Friday Fast" seems to have been the fatal ounce on the camel's back! And as a specimen of the intelligence, as well as depth of his grief, he breaks forth in the following language of gloomy apprehension: "Perhaps it will come to this, that some of the Sabbaths will be thought to have a superior sanctity and solemnity above others, as the *Passion*, Palm, or Easter Sunday!" "This is as good soil for the devil to till as any that he ever turned." "All this boast of our puritanical paternity is ridiculously tumid. Who that is acquainted with father and son, would notice the least resemblance?" All this is certainly rich; and, we think, not a little significant.

The last Sermon, by Mr. Bridgman, is a "Plea for Union;" and is a masterly presentation of the evils and the unscripturalness of *denominationalism*. The Sermon is a noble illustration of a man rising above the contracted genius, the petty proportions of his own little sect, and looking out after a Church as Catholic as the Love of God in Christ, and as comprehensive as the wants of humanity. May he have Grace to see, that just such a Church already stands with its doors wide open to receive the multitudes who, like him, are seeking for a city of refuge.

THE REV. DR. WILLIAM BACON STEVENS' SERMON, in Trinity Church, Pittsburgh, Penn., May 8th, 1859. "The Book of Prayer for the House of Prayer." 8vo. pp. 32.

With the strange anomaly before us of an almost universal dissatisfaction with extemporaneous prayers and of a desire to return to Liturgical Worship among the sects around us, and at the same time of a persistent disparaging of Liturgies on the part of a few prominent men in the Church, we are glad to see so admirable a Sermon as that of Dr. Stevens now before us. The thorough acquaintance with Liturgical literature, the true tone of Catholic culture, the manly and Christian sympathy with the Gospel as something broader than a mere petty sect—all these, which are reflected in this noble Discourse, are worthy of special commendation. We wish all our Clergy would give it a careful reading.

THE REV. DR. BELLOWS' ADDRESS to the Alumni of the Divinity School of Harvard University, July 19, 1859. "The Suspense of Faith." New York: C. S. Francis. 8vo. pp. 46.

We have alluded to this singular "Address" in the department of Domestic Intelligence.

REV. DR. C. M. BUTLER'S SERMON: "Private Revenge;" in Trinity Church, Washington, D. C., May 8th, 1859. 8vo. pp. 20.

REV. DR. G. S. COIT'S CONVENTION SERMON, in Christ Church, Hartford, Conn., June 14th, 1859. "Priestly Fidelity to the Church of Christ." 8vo. pp. 23.

True, pointed, and pertinent.

THE REV. B. H. PADDOCK'S SERMON before the Christian Knowledge Society, June 14th, 1859, in Christ Church, Hartford, Conn. 8vo. pp. 15.

Large portions of this excellent Sermon have already appeared in the Church papers.

REV. HORACE HILL, JR.'S, SERMON on the Death of Bishop Doane; "A great man has fallen;" in St. Paul's Church, Rahway, N. J. May 1, 1859.

REV. C. F. HOFFMAN'S SERMON, at the laying of the Corner Stone of St. James' Church, Hackettstown, N. J., April 26th, 1859.

THE REV. RICHARD COX'S FAREWELL SERMON, in Zion Church, New York City, June 12th, 1859. 8vo. pp. 17.

REV. DR. R. H. CLARKSON'S Tenth Anniversary Sermon, in St. James' Church, Chicago, Ill.

A startling and praiseworthy record of parochial life and duty.

THOMAS M. BROWN'S Address before the House of Convocation of Trinity College, June 29th, 1859. 8vo. pp. 25.

NINTH ANNUAL REPORTS, &c., of the "Church Home," Charleston, S. C., at St. Philip's Church, June 16th, 1859. 8vo. pp. 15.

SIXTH ANNUAL ADDRESS of the Rector, and Parish Statistics, of Christ Church, Elizabeth, N. J., April 24th, 1859. 8vo. pp. 27.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY MEETING, Reports, &c., of the Missionary Society of St. Paul's Church, New Haven, Conn., May 15th, 1859. 8vo. pp. 16.

SIXTH PASTORAL REPORT of the Rector of Trinity Church, Pottsville, Penn' Epiphany. 1859.

CATALOGUE, Reports, &c., of General Theological Seminary, New York City. 1859.

The number of Students on the Catalogue is *forty-three*.

CATALOGUE of the Theological Seminary, and Kenyon College. 1859. Gambier, Ohio.

There are, Theological Students, 21; Undergraduates, 127; Grammar School, 81; in all, 229.

REGISTER OF THE COLLEGE OF ST. JAMES. 1859.

The number of Students in the College is 51; in the Grammar School, 63; in all, 114.

TENTH ANNUAL ANNOUNCEMENT of the Female Medical College of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. 1859.

The whole number of Students in the Session of 1858-'59, was thirty-six; and the Degree of Doctor of Medicine was conferred on six ladies.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Alston, W. J.	Mellvaine,	June 25,	Rosse Chapel, Gambier, Ohio.
Brooks, Philipps,	Meade,	July 1,	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Clarke, Hugh L. M.	Whittingham,	July 20,	St. Barnabas, Burlington, N. J.
Clemson, Thomas G.	Lee, A.	July 10,	Ascension, Claymont, Del.
Crystall, James S.	Whittingham,	July 20,	St. Barnabas, Burlington, N. J.
En-me-gah-bowh, J. J.	Kemper,	July 8,	Good Shepherd, Faribault, Minn.
Erben, W. B.	Bowman,	June 19,	St. Matthew's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Finch, Peter Voorhees,	Potter, H.	July 3,	Trinity, New York City.
Ganter, R. L.	Mellvaine,	June 25,	Rosse Chapel, Gambier, Ohio.
Gesner, Abm. Herbert,	Potter, H.	July 3,	Trinity, New York City.
Gilliam, Edward W.	Atkinson,	July 11,	Emmanuel, Warrenton, N. C.
Gray, Wm. Crane,	Otey,	June 26,	Christ, Nashville, Tenn.
Greene, Wm. Wallace,	Meade,	July 17,	Old Chapel, Clarke Co., Va.
Hare, Wm. Hobart,	Bowman,	June 19,	St. Matthew's, Philadelphia, Pa.
Henderson, George D.	Kemper,	Aug. 14,	Leavenworth, Kansas.
High, N. Rue,	Kemper,	June 19,	Nashotah Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Hubbard, George,	Payne,	Jan. 23,	Epiphany, Cavalla, Africa.
Kidder, Joseph,	Meade,	July 1,	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Lewis, George S.	Whittingham,	July 20,	St. Barnabas, Burlington, N. J.
McCarty, John W.	Mellvaine,	June 25,	Rosse Chapel, Gambier, Ohio.
M'Kim, John Linn,	Lee, A.	July 10,	Ascension, Claymont, Del.
Monro, Geo. Nugent,	Potter, H.	July 3,	Trinity, New York City.
Morrill, Charles Wm.	Potter, H.	July 3,	Trinity, New York City.
Olds, M. L.	Kemper,	June 22,	Gethsemane, Minnesota.
Paddeck, Wilbur F.	Meade,	July 1,	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Parker, Henry M.	Boone,	July 10,	Ascension, New York City.
Purdon, Henry,	Boone,	July 7,	St. George's, New York City.
Reilly, T. M.	Kemper,	June 19,	Nashotah Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Schereschewsky, S. I. J.	Boone,	July 7,	St. George's, New York City.
Seymour, Edward,	Kemper,	June 19,	Nashotah Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Smith, Dudley D.	Boone,	July 7,	St. George's, New York City.
Stewart, George,	Kemper,	June 19,	Nashotah Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Strong, George A.	Meade,	July 1,	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Thompson, E. H.	Boone,	July 7,	St. George's, New York City.
Townsend, Hale,	Meade,	July 1,	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Watson, Edw. Shippen,	Whittingham,	July 20,	St. Barnabas, Burlington, N. J.
Weller, M. Leander,	Kemper,	June 19,	Nashotah Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Wilson, Wm. Thomas,	Potter, H.	July 3,	Trinity, New York City.
Yocom, Thomas S.	Bowman,	June 19,	St. Matthew's, Philadelphia, Pa.

PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Curry, Charles R.	Whittingham,	June 19,	St. Timothy's, Catonsville, Md.
" Etheridge, S. S.	Kemper,	June 19,	Nashotah Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
" Fearnas, C. W.	Mcllvaine,	June 5,	Trinity, Columbus, Ohio.
" Gasman, John G.	Kemper,	June 19,	Nashotah Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
" Galusha, M. H.	Johns,	July 1,	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
" Holcomb, T. J.	Kemper,	June 19,	Nashotah Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
" Holden, Richard,	Mcllvaine,	June 25,	Rosse Chapel, Gambier, Ohio.
" Jacobs, W. F. M.	Johns,	July 1,	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
" Keeling, R. J.	Lee, A.	July 6,	St. Thomas', Newark, Del.
" Loring, Henry H.	Hopkins,	July 16,	St. Stephen's, Middlebury, Vt.
" Maltby, B. K.	Mcllvaine,	June 5,	Trinity, Columbus, Ohio.
" Wiley, A. M.	Rowman,	June 19,	St. Matthew's, Philadelphia, Pa.
" Willas, D. Ellis,	Potter, H.	July 3,	Trinity, New York City.
" Williams, W. W.	Johns,	July 1,	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
" Wingfield, J. H. D.	Johns,	July 1,	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.

CONSECRATIONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Calvary,	Atkinson,	July 30,	Buncombe Co., N. C.
Christ,	Davis,	June 5,	Mars Bluff, S. C.
St. Helena,	Davis,	July —,	St. Helenaville, S. C.
St. Luke's,	Potter, H.	July 10,	East Hampton, N. Y.
St. Mark's,	Kemper,	June 22,	North Minneapolis, Minn.
St. Matthew's,	Polk,	June 2,	Houma, La.
St. Paul's,	Kemper,	June 29,	St. Paul, Minn.
St. Paul's,	Hawks,	June 19,	St. Louis, Mo.
St. Paul's,	Kemper,	Aug. 11,	Wyandott, Kansas.
Trinity,	Kemper,	July 26,	Lawrence, Kansas.
Trinity,	Potter, H.	July 31,	Sharon Springs, N. Y.
	Meade,	July 23,	Fauquier, Va.

OBITUARY.

The Rev. WILLIAM W. BOSTWICK was born in Whitestown, Oneida county, N. Y., on the 19th February, 1797. His father, originally from New Milford, Ct., sought a home in the wilds of Western New York, and when his son was two years old, he removed to Auburn, where he resided twenty-seven years, until his death in 1826. He was the principal founder of the Church in that village, acting as Lay reader long before there was either Clergyman or House of Worship. His *thirteen* children grew up in earnest attachment to the religious principles of their parents, and the family was a rare example, not only of domestic happiness, but of those Christian virtues which win universal respect, and, when associated with the early history of a Parish, are remembered as a part of the heritage of the Church.

William, the oldest son, evinced a love of study at an early age, and, his diligent application having mastered all the ordinary parts of a school education, the establishment of the Auburn Academy afforded him the opportunity, without leaving the parental roof, of prosecuting the higher branches of learning, and under the instruction of Mr. N. D. Strong, he pursued the study of the Latin and Greek languages. It was not until he was near twenty-one years of age, that he left home to complete his academic studies. After the removal of the Rev. Dr. McDonald from Auburn to Fairfield, in Herkimer County, young Bostwick followed him, in the winter of 1818, and in about two years completed his collegiate course at that institution, having had every advantage except the honor of a degree. He then commenced the study of Theology, in company of several

others, candidates for the Ministry, remaining at Fairfield for that purpose, and enjoying the wise counsel and able instruction of Dr. McDonald until he was called, in 1821, to take charge of the new academy established at Geneva. Thither several of his former pupils followed him, and among them Mr. Bostwick, who, for the next three years, divided his time between the labor of teaching, and the more congenial work of completing his Theological course. He was admitted to the Order of Deacons on the 15th April, 1825, at the city of New Brunswick, by the Bishop of New Jersey acting for Bishop Hobart, who was then in Europe. In June following, he entered upon that career of Missionary labor to which, for twenty years, he gave himself with great devotion, until arrested by the hand of death, in the then distant outpost of an infant parish in the Diocese of Illinois. But although the last three years of his Ministry were passed in another Diocese, he was in the truest sense a son of Western New York. He had identified himself with the Academy at Geneva while it was struggling into the higher position of a College, and when the first Commencement was held in September, 1826, he, together with three others in similar circumstances, received the Baccalaureate Degree, and became an alumnus of the College, although he was not a member of the College Class; and if we regard the purpose of his life, and the fidelity with which he made the acquisitions of learning minister to the interests of religion, few were more worthy of college honors. The course of the humble missionary in the new settlements of our country is not apt to be a brilliant one. The laying of foundations is not commonly a work which excites admiration. But he who forsakes the cloisters of learning, and foregoes the charms of quiet study, that he may carry the blessings of the Gospel to the scattered hamlets and rustic villages of a newly settled country, submitting to the discomforts of an unsettled life, and fatiguing journeys and scanty means of support, is an honor to his nursing mother, not less than he who from the retirement of his closet, sends out the productions of his pen to do battle against error and to defend the truth. No graduate of Geneva College has been more faithful, or perhaps more successful, than the subject of this memoir; and his work was not an offering that cost him nothing. His paternal home had been a pleasant one, and surrounded by every comfort. He had not been brought up to hardships. He had not struggled with poverty in acquiring his education. And yet, from the time when he was set apart to the sacred Office, he entered zealously into the pioneer work of the Church, and never looked back from the plough to which he had put his hand. His first field of labor was in the counties of Yates and Steuben. From the pleasant village of Bath as a center, he extended his services over a district of country fifty miles in diameter—officiating at Penn Yan, Wayne, Tyrone, Hopeton, Pleasant Valley, Painted Post, Prattstown, Jerusalem, Dresden, and Bologna. In less than a year congregations were fully organized at Bath and at Penn Yan. In the beginning of 1827, his labors were extended into the county of Alleghany, and resulted in the organization of a parish at Angelica, to which, although forty miles distant from his residence, he ministered one half the time for the next eighteen months. In the early part of the following year he made missionary visits to Olean and Ellicottville, in the county of Cattaraugus, seeking out the scattered members of the Church, baptizing their children, and preparing the way for fully organized Societies and regular services. In April, 1828, Mr. Bostwick was married to Miss Mary Lewis, in Litchfield, Connecticut. In June of that year a new congregation was organized in the little village of Hammondsport, six miles from Bath, and at the head of Crooked Lake. The one Sunday a month given to that little flock was soon increased to two. In 1833, a neat Church edifice was consecrated, and twenty-five communicants reported, where, four or five years before, only a single voice responded in the services of the public worship.

The two congregations at Bath and Hammondsport continued to receive the equally divided services of the missionary for seven years; other villages adjacent, in the mean time, not being neglected.

In midsummer, 1840, the society at Bath needing the services of a settled Pastor, Mr. Bostwick left it in other hands, and for the next two years, Wayne, Hornelaville, and other villages received his ministrations instead. The entire

period of his ministry at Bath was fifteen years. But although Hammondsport was a less important town, there were circumstances of a domestic nature which made it more truly the home of the missionary for about fourteen years. On the 1st January, 1829, he purchased a lot in this village, and subsequently built upon it a dwelling for his family. Here he had a garden gently sloping toward the waters of the Lake, and a great part of his leisure hours was devoted to horticulture. His father before him had set an example in his garden at Auburn, which might have inspired a taste for what the Christian poet terms "Relics of Eden's Bowers." Although he was able to surround his family with the comforts of home, he never indulged in luxuries that he could not procure thus by his own labors; and by far the greatest enjoyment with him was imparting happiness to others. The fruits and flowers that made his home so delightful were used to minister not only to the pleasure of visitors, (for he delighted in hospitality,) but they were sent far and near, cheering many a sick room. The wine which he made from his grape harvest was stored for that purpose, and for sacramental uses, nor was it ever used for mere indulgence at home.

In the summer of 1842, Mr. Bostwick's attention was drawn to the West as an important field for missionary labor, and he made a journey of exploration. In the autumn of that year he removed his family to Illinois, and assumed the pastoral care of the congregation at Joliet. Here he continued to labor with his accustomed diligence, performing much missionary work in addition to his stated services at Joliet, until the autumn of 1845. On the 28th September in that year, his wife, after a long and painful illness, endured with the greatest Christian fortitude, departed this life. Mr. Bostwick was taken ill with a bilious fever, a week previous to her death, and his sickness was aggravated by fatigue and anxiety, and the sad scenes of her decease and burial. On Sunday, the 5th October, after calling his children around him, he requested his friends to sing the 28th Hymn. Their full hearts permitted them only to reach the end of the first verse:

"With joy shall I behold the day," &c.

At the conclusion of the verse, he exclaimed, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly," and then fainted. Reviving, however, he lived until the next evening, uttering nothing audible, but retaining his consciousness to the last. Thus, in the confidence of that Faith which he had preached to others, and in his 49th year, he rested from his labors. His dying message to his distant friends evinced the tenor of his life: "Assure my mother," said he, "of my love and dutiful regards, and say to her that I die trusting alone in the merits of my Saviour, that I have no work or merit of my own to plead, but the atonement of my Saviour is my trust for salvation; and to my dear sisters and brothers say, I hope they may all hold on their Christian course unto the end, that we may all be united in heaven."

The Rev. Ezra B. Kellogg, who had been his friend and classmate at the East, came from Chicago, forty miles, (being the nearest clergyman,) to preach and officiate at the burial, first of Mrs. Bostwick, and then of her husband. On the following Sunday, Mr. Kellogg, by request of his congregation in Chicago, again pronounced a discourse, commemorating his departed friend as one who, by the whole course of his ministerial life in the pioneer work of the Church, had merited the title of "The faithful and industrious missionary."

Mr. Bostwick was not a brilliant scholar nor a popular preacher; but he had the elements of a useful clergyman. Studious, sedate, devout, he gave himself from an early day, with great sincerity, to the work of the Sacred Office. Unaffected piety and purity of life were the fragrance which embalmed his memory in the hearts of all who knew him. His three orphan children were left to the care of friends, who rejoice to see them walking in the way their father led. The oldest, having received his education in part at Jubilee College, is now a clergyman in the Diocese of Illinois.

This brief record, too long delayed, is due to the memory of one who, we believe, will not be forgotten in the day when the LORD will come to make up His jewels;

when human judgments of greatness will be reversed; when the last will be first and the first last.

The Rev. HENRY B. GOODWIN died at Norton, Mass., June 2d, at his residence, aged fifty-seven, of the Diocese of Maryland, a resident of Charles Co. He graduated at Brown University, in 1825, studied Theology at the Alexandria Seminary, and was Ordained by Bishop Meade. He commenced his ministry at Nottingham, Prince George's Co., Maryland; and although for many years he has held no Parochial charge, yet he continued in the occasional performance of Ministerial duty till near the time of his death.

The Rev. CHARLES S. WILLIAMS, D. D., died at Philadelphia, Pa., June 12th, 1859, aged sixty-seven years. He was born on the 11th of June, 1791, in the County of Kent, England, where his father, the Rev. William Williams, was Rector of a Parish. He entered the army when very young, and passed some time in India. On his return, he joined the dragoons, and served with them during part of the Peninsular War. On the field of Toulouse he was severely wounded, and was left all night among the dying and the dead. He graduated at St. John's College, Cambridge, and was Ordained in 1820, by the Lord Bishop (Tomline) of Lincoln. In 1823, he came to this country, and became Rector of St. John's Church, York, Pa. He was unanimously elected President of Baltimore College, and continued in this Office about eight years, having, at the same time, charge of the Parish at Elk Ridge, where the most affectionate relations existed between him and his parishioners. For the last twenty-two years Dr. Williams resided in Philadelphia, devoting himself to the cause of education, and officiating almost constantly on Sundays for his brethren of the Clergy. His last Ministerial act was at Emmanuel Church, Holmesburg. He went to officiate for the Rector of that Parish, on Sunday, the 15th of May. During the Sermon he was attacked by paralysis. He lingered until the 12th of June, when he calmly sunk to rest, having just reached his sixty-eighth year.

The Rev. LEVI BULL, D. D., died at Marsh, Chester Co., Pa., August 2d, in the seventy-ninth year of his age. For many years his position in the Diocese was a prominent one. Unhappily, his clear, vigorous intellect, became disordered a few years ago, and though there were frequently long periods in which there were no signs of derangement, yet all felt that his career as a Minister was virtually ended. His last public Ministerial act was to assist at the Ordination of his grandson, Mr. Thomas G. Clemson, at Claymount, Delaware. He has been Rector of St. Mary's, St. Andrew's, and St. Mark's Churches, in Chester Co.; St. Thomas', Berks Co.; and Bangor Church, Lancaster Co.; all of which, we believe, were organized and built up by his exertions.

The Rev. JOSEPH SCOTT died at Naugatuck, Conn., August 17th, aged fifty-nine years. Mr. Scott graduated at Trinity College, in August, 1827; studied Theology at the General Theological Seminary, was Ordained Deacon, June 1st, 1831, and Priest, September 28, 1832, by Bishop Brownell, in Christ Church, Hartford. He has officiated in Woodbury, Roxbury, Bethlehem, Derby, Stratford, Naugatuck, and North Haven, Conn. On Sunday, April 18th, 1858, he was stricken down with paralysis, since which, he has been incapacitated for active duty.

ELECTION OF THE BISHOP OF MINNESOTA.

At the Second Annual Convention of this Diocese, held in St. Paul's Church, in the city of St. Paul, June 29th, on the second ballot of the Clergy, the Rev. HENRY B. WHIPPLE, Rector of the Holy Communion Church, Chicago, was elected Bishop of the Diocese, by a vote of 14, to 4 for Rev. Mr. Patterson, of St. Paul, and by the unanimous vote of the Laity.

On the first ballot, the vote stood as follows:

Of the Clergy: Rev. Dr. Tucker, Troy, N. Y., 11; Rev. Dr. Patterson, St. Paul, Min., 3; Rev. Dr. A. H. Vinton, Philadelphia, Pa., 2; Rev. Dr. Littlejohn, New Haven, Conn., 1; Rev. H. B. Whipple, Chicago, Ill., 1.

Of the Laity: for the Rev. Dr. Tucker, 10; against him, 11.

MISSION TO CHINA STRENGTHENED.

Our report of Ordinations gives the names of several Missionaries who have lately been sent out to strengthen the forces of the Mission in China. On Sunday evening, July 16th, in the Church of the Ascension, New York City, a farewell meeting was held, at 8 o'clock, for the purpose of taking leave of the following Missionaries, about to proceed to China, who were all present except Rev. Mr. Parker:

Bishop Boone; Rev. Messrs Parker, S. C., Smith, Ala., Yocum, Pa., Purdon, Pa., Thompson, Va. from the Seminary of Virginia; Schereschewsky, Md. from the General Theological Seminary, N. Y.: Mr. Doyen, Md., Teacher of Boys' School; Mr. Hubbell, N. Y., Financial Agent of the Mission, (both these last are candidates for Holy Orders;) Mrs. Boone, Mrs. Parker, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Yocum, Mrs. Doyen. These fourteen constituted the Missionary force. There were also a lady communicant, and a native Chinese, who, having attended Bishop Boone to this country, was now a brother among them, and was appointed colloquial teacher to the expedition. There were also two children, and a faithful domestic, making nineteen in all, who sailed from New York in the "*Golden Rule*," on Wednesday, July 13th. Addresses were made by Bishop Boone, the Rev. Drs. Bedell, Turner, Hawks, and Tyng, and the Rev. Messrs. Wilson and Purdon, of the Mission. Between \$20,000 and \$30,000 has been specially raised for the purpose of sending out and supporting these Missionaries.

CHURCH BOOK SOCIETY.

At the Annual Meeting of the Board of Managers, held in New York, June 29th, a Report was presented, from which it appears that sixty-seven volumes of new books have been added to the Catalogue during the last year. During the preceding year, the number of new volumes was forty-eight. These, added to the sixty-seven volumes now reported, make one hundred and fifteen volumes, or more than a volume a week during the past two years, and more than a fourth of all the books published by the Society during the thirty-three years since its formation. The Report states, "to sum up, we have published sixty-seven books during the past year, have paid \$1,084.02 interest on the funded debt, have reduced the funded debt \$3,035, have granted to destitute Parishes books to the amount of \$972.08, and find the Society \$3,798.72 better off than it was a year ago."

Such a record is full proof of the efficiency of the General Agent, the Rev. Mr. Harriman. The great want of the Society now, is funds to publish new books, and to supply destitute Sunday Schools in the Mission fields of the Church. To secure this end, the services of the Rev. William Watson, of Hudson, N. Y., have been engaged—a gentleman whose energy and perseverance are fully equal to the emergency.

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL.

At a meeting of the Trustees of the Berkeley Divinity School, holden in Hartford, Conn., June 15th, the Rev. Samuel Fuller, D. D., Rector of Christ Church, Andover, Mass., was elected to the Professorship of the "Interpretation of the Scriptures," vacated by the resignation of Prof. Harwood. Dr. Fuller was formerly Pastor of the Church in Litchfield, Conn. He is an excellent Biblical Scholar, a sound Divine, an earnest, devout man, whose influence in training young men for the Christian Ministry, will render him a valuable accession to this promising School.

FARIBAULT MISSION.

In our Domestic Intelligence, is a record of the Ordination of *En-me-gah-bowh*, a Chippewa Indian. The Ordination Services brought together the Chiefs of the Chippewa and Sioux tribes, which have always been hereditary foes; and the speeches of these Chiefs to each other, to the Bishop, and to the Missionaries, and the whole scene around the Cross of a common Saviour, were in the highest degree dramatic and inspiring. The Faribault "Missionary Paper, No. One," informs us, that within the first year of the Mission, three Parishes have been organized, several Stations have been regularly visited, it has a day school of nearly one hundred pupils, and four young men have already sought admission to the Divinity department. The Indian Mission strictly, at St. Columba, under the care of the Rev. E. Steele Peake, lies one hundred and fifty miles to the north of Faribault, but Indian children of promise are admitted to the Faribault Mission School. Faribault lies five hundred miles northwest of Nashotah, and it is, strictly speaking, the only Church School in a country more than five hundred miles in length and breadth. The "Associate Mission" is under the care of Rev. J. Lloyd Breck, the Rev. Solon W. Manney, the Rev. E. Steele Peake, and the Rev. J. J. Eamegabowh.

THEODORE PARKER AT CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY.

At the late College Commencement, the Association of Unitarian Clergymen, Alumni of the Cambridge Divinity School, refused to pass a resolution of condolence to Rev. Theodore Parker, who is a graduate of the School, now absent for the benefit of his health, in Europe, by a vote of two to one. Rev. Dr. Gannett, of Boston, said: "Another part of his preaching was doing a great harm to society, by unsettling men's faith in the doctrines of the Church, and in Revelation." Rev. Dr. Osgood, of New York, said: "While he sympathized with the man, he could not endorse him as a Christian. Especially his spirit he believed to be un-Christian. This had been manifested not only in former years, but in his late book it appeared in a great degree." Rev. Dr. Burnap, of Baltimore, commenced an "elaborate argument to show that Mr. Parker was an enemy to the Bible, condemning him for continuing to preach from it while he denied its Divine origin." And yet, notwithstanding the gross blasphemies of Theodore Parker, a fact which these very "polite" and very "liberal" gentlemen could not deny, they simply refrained from passing a vote of condolence. Mr. Parker will despise their timidity, laugh at their silliness, and exult over their inconsistency; for he will tell them that in their vote they have dared to act, neither in the character of gentlemen or Christians.

NEW MOVEMENT AMONG THE UNITARIANS.

The late developments of Unitarianism have thoroughly frightened some of the leading men of that sect, who are now discussing, *de novo*, the nature of the system, and are proposing new and important organic changes. The movement is one of the most curious and startling "signs of the times." Recent Discourses, and papers by the Rev. Drs. Bellows, Osgood, and others, in favor of a Liturgy, (now, as is said, in preparation,) and advocating a "New Catholic Church," a new "Broad Church," &c., show that these men see and feel the essential, normal emptiness and rottenness of Unitarianism, as a system. The Rev. Drs. Dewey, Walker, Hedge, Ellis, and Farley, are said to sympathize with the new movement. The Rev. Dr. Frothingham publicly opposes it. What these men are really feeling after, though they do not know it, is the Old Catholic Church, not a New one. They can no more create a Church, than they can create a world. And this is the very thing that they have yet to learn. In our recent review of Mr. Hun-

tington's new Liturgy at Cambridge, we examined the whole movement as a natural historical Puritan development. Let the Church be but true to herself, and she can hardly fail to reap abundant fruits from this important change in public sentiment.

KANSAS ORGANIZATION.

The Convention of Kansas met at Wyandott on the 11th of August, and adjourned at the close of the following day. *Nine Clerical* and some *twelve Lay delegates* were in attendance. The question of organizing Kansas into a Diocese was taken up, and resulted in an organization; and the Missionary District was erected into a Diocese by a vote of fourteen to six. The Committees then reported on Constitution, Canons, &c., which were submitted to the Convention, and after some amendments, were adopted. The Convention then proceeded to the election of a Standing Committee, consisting of three Clergy and three Laymen, and also elected delegates to the next General Convention, to consist of four of each order.

This movement on the part of the Churchmen of Kansas of course places the matter of the election of a Bishop of that Diocese in their own hands; and that question cannot come before the next General Convention at Richmond. A resolution was passed unanimously requesting the House of Bishops to make some arrangements by which the Diocese of Kansas might still enjoy, for a time at least, the Episcopal supervision of Bishop Kemper.

CHURCH IN TENNESSEE.

At the Convention at Knoxville, May 29th, some important matters were acted upon. The following Resolution was passed unanimously:

Whereas, It is greatly to be desired that the Legislation of the Church should be confided to members of the Body of Christ, therefore

Be it Resolved, That the vestries within the Diocese be requested to send hereafter as Lay Delegates to the Convention, none other but Communicants, if practicable.

The following was lost only by the casting vote of the Bishop.

It is manifest from the frequent declarations, and the impaired health of many Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, that the amount of toil and labor, travel and fatigue, arising from the extent and largeness of their Dioceses is much greater than can be well endured in the proper and faithful discharge of their holy office; and it is also manifest that the exigencies of the times require frequent, prompt, and protracted visitations among the Churches already organized, and that if parishes are to be speedily and permanently established in places now destitute of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, the Bishops, after the custom of the Apostles of whom they are the successors, must go as leaders and advisers of their presbyters, that the Church may be felt in her power and strength, and seen in the beauty of her holiness.

Resolved therefore, That the Lay and Clerical delegates of the Diocese of Tennessee, to the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church which is to convene at Richmond, Va., on the first Wednesday in October next, are hereby earnestly requested, if any opportunity whatever affords, to use their power and influence to reduce the geographical boundaries of the Dioceses, and thereby increase their number, that the American Church may be rendered more efficient in the great work which she has to accomplish, and approximate more closely to the form and usages of the Church Catholic in her primitive and pure days.

We do not hesitate to say that there is no one subject which needs to be so boldly met and thoroughly discussed, as this whole question of the Episcopate. Our popular notion of the Episcopate, and our uniform practice are, in several vital points, utterly and totally unprimitive. Our Church is in fact Presbyterian in

Administration; our Bishops, (some of them,) are killing themselves with the merest round of perfunctory duties; while, under our present system, no provision is made for reaching the great mass of our teeming population. A Missionary Itineracy might do something, if the right men could be found for the work; but there is the difficulty. Our Saviour said, "he that is greatest among you shall be your servant," but we have reversed all that. It is, perhaps, too much to expect that the General Convention at Richmond will move in this matter; but the Church will come to it, sooner or later, because it is Christ's way. Meanwhile, He will punish the Church, as He is punishing her for her blindness, by inward distractions, and by giving the Vineyard over into other hands.

NEW SCHISM AMONG THE METHODISTS.

Disclosures have just been made to us, and on the best authority, of the most startling character; but which are studiously concealed by the Methodist press, which show that a spirit of resistance to the despotism of the Methodist System is ripening with portentous rapidity, all over the country. In several of the Atlantic cities, in Western New York, in all the West, and especially in Illinois, the movement is carrying everything before it. And yet, the past success of Methodism has been owing mainly to the grinding despotic power of that system; too grinding and despotic to be permanent. Dr. Stevens will soon have enough to do, in the intervals of puffing his own book in his own paper. John Wesley was a true seer when he said, "If the Methodists desert the Church of England, God will desert them."



SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF ANTIGUA.

The Right Reverend STEPHEN JORDAN RIGAUD, D. D., Lord Bishop of Antigua, died on the 16th of May, at his residence, Clare Hall, Antigua, of Yellow Fever. The Rev. Stephen Gordon Rigaud, F. R. A. S., matriculated at Exeter College, Oxford; was double first-class and S. C. L. 1838, B. A. 1841, M. A. 1842, B. D. and D. D. 1854. He was ordained Deacon 1840, and Priest 1842, both by Bishop Bagot of Oxford; became Fellow, Tutor, and Examiner of Exeter College, 1845 and 1846; Head Master of Queen Elizabeth's School, Ipswich, 1850; and was consecrated Bishop of Antigua, 1857, (Episcopal jurisdiction—Antigua, Nevis, St. Kitt's, Montserrat, Virgin Islands, and Dominica; extent, seven hundred and fifty-one square miles; number of Clergy, thirty-three; population, one hundred and six thousand three hundred and seventy-two; gross income of See, 2,000*l.*, from the Consolidated Fund;) was author and editor of "Letters of Scientific Men;" "Newton and Contemporaries," University of Oxford, 1841; "Defense of Halley against the Charge of Religious Infidelity," printed for the Ashmolean Society; "Sermons on the Lord's Prayer." 8vo. 1852.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF DURHAM.

The Right Rev. E. MALTRY, D. D., late Lord Bishop of Durham, died July 3d, at Upper Portland Place, aged 89 years. He was born in St. George Tomland, in the city of Norwich, in the year 1770, and was educated at Winchester College, and subsequently entered Pembroke College, Cambridge, where he graduated as

B. A. in 1792, M. A. in 1794, B. D. in 1801, and D. D. in 1806. He gained the prize medals for Greek odes in 1790 and 1791, and the Chancellor's medal in 1792 for classics, in which year he was eighth wrangler. He was Chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln, and held one of the prebends of his Cathedral, as also the living of Buckden. He published an edition of Morell's *Lexicon Græco-Proslodiacum*, Sermons, &c. He was consecrated Bishop of Chichester in 1831, and was translated to Durham in 1836. He resigned the latter See, under Act of Parliament, in September, 1856, which took away his seat in Parliament, and left him an annuity of 4,500*l*. The deceased prelate was visitor of Durham University, and a member of the Senate of the University of London.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF SIERRA LEONE.

The Right Rev. JOHN BOWEN, LL. D., Bishop of Sierra Leone, died of an attack of Yellow Fever on Saturday, June 2d, at his residence, Fourah Bay, near Free Town, Sierra Leone. The Right Rev. John Bowen was in the early part of his life engaged in farming operations in Canada, and when the rebellion broke out served in the militia of that country. In 1842 he came to Ireland, and entered Trinity College, Dublin, where he took the degrees of B. A., M. A., and LL. D. Subsequently he was ordained by Dr. Longley, the Bishop of Durham, then Bishop of Ripon; and in 1847 he went to Palestine and the East, where he remained some three or four years, making during this time the acquaintance of Mr. Layard, the celebrated traveler, and assisting at his excavations of Nineveh. Having returned to England, he was in 1853 presented by the Marquis of Huntley to the rectory of Orton-Longville with Botolph-bridge, which he held for four years, and until his appointment to the See of Sierra Leone, vacant by the death of Dr. Weeks, the second Bishop. He was consecrated at Lambeth, September 23d, 1857, and arrived at Freetown in December, 1857, and had consequently held his Bishopric only two years and five months at the time of his death. The Diocese of Sierra Leone, was founded in 1850, and has had three Bishops since that time,—the Right Revs. O. E. Vidal, J. W. Weeks, and the prelate just deceased, all of whom died a sacrifice to the climate of the country. The jurisdiction of the See extends over the western coast of Africa, between the 20° north and the 20° south latitude, including the colonies of Sierra Leone, the Gambia, the Gold Coast, and their dependencies. The number of Clergy of the Diocese is twenty-one; the population forty-five thousand; and the gross income of the Bishop 900*l*., viz, 500*l*. from allowance as Colonial Chaplain, and 400*l*. from the Colonial Bishops' Fund.

And yet as to the unhealthiness of the climate, the *Clerical Journal*, to which valuable paper we are mainly indebted for the above facts, has the following important items:

"The successive deaths of three Bishops of Sierra Leone, after very short incumbencies, being calculated to produce an unfavorable impression of the climate, the following facts are submitted for consideration:—Bishop Bowen went out to Sierra Leone, December, 1857. He found five European Missionaries in Sierra Leone, who had been laboring there for the following periods, twenty, seventeen, fifteen, five, and two years respectively. Six Europeans went out at the same time with the Bishop. He is the only one who has fallen of the whole body of twelve Europeans, during a season of unprecedented sickness and mortality. During the last thirty years the Society has sent out from year to year fifty-three Europeans as missionaries, catechists, or schoolmasters, of whom fourteen have died in Africa, or after their return home, of the effects of the climate; one after twenty-eight years' service, one after nineteen years, two after sixteen years, and one after eight years; the other nine at earlier periods, chiefly through acclimating fever before the introduction of quinine treatment. For the last ten years not one such early death has occurred; seven have retired after length of service from twenty-one to fifteen years; seventeen are still laboring in Africa; two are laboring as missionaries elsewhere; thirteen have retired, from various causes,

after two or three years in Africa. These results will bear a favorable comparison with any other tropical climate."

STILL MORE NEW MISSIONARY DIOCESES.

DIOCESE OF BRISBANE.—Her Majesty has been pleased to constitute the new colony to be a Bishop's See and Diocese, to be called the Bishopric of Brisbane; and to appoint the Rev. Edward Wyndham Tuffnell, D. D., to be ordained and consecrated Bishop of the said See.

DIOCESE OF ST. HELENA —Her Majesty has further been pleased to constitute the island of St. Helena to be a Bishop's See and Diocese, to be called the Bishopric of St. Helena, and to appoint the Rev. Piers Calvey Cloughton, D. D., to be ordained and consecrated Bishop of the said See. It is said, that he will have superintendence of the English congregations in South America, according to the original suggestion of the Bishop of Capetown.

CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOPS OF BANGOR, BRISBANE, AND ST. HELENA.

On Tuesday, June 14th, in Westminster Abbey, there were consecrated the Ven. JAMES COLQUHOUN CAMPBELL, D. D., to the Bishopric of Bangor, in the room of Dr. Bethell, deceased; the Rev. EDWARD WYNDHAM TUFFNELL, D. D., to the newly erected Bishopric of Brisbane, Australia; and the Rev. PIERS CALVEY CLAUGHTON, D. D., to the newly erected Bishopric of St. Helena. There were present the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London, Oxford, Salisbury, Columbia, Western New York, Llandaff, Brechin, and Capetown; the Dean of Westminster, the Sub-Dean, (Lord John Thynne,) and a large number of Clergymen in their robes, who were accommodated within the rails of the Communion-table. The Primate read the Communion Service, the Bishop of Capetown reading the Epistle, and the Bishop of Salisbury the Gospel. The preacher was the Rev. Thomas Legh Cloughton, M. A., Honorary Canon of Worcester, Vicar of Kidderminster, and Professor of Poetry at Oxford. His text was Acts viii, 14-17. The elected Bishops (vested in their rochets) were presented to the Archbishop by the Bishops of Oxford and Llandaff, the oaths administered, and the new Bishops having assumed the Episcopal habit, were admitted to their office by the imposition of hands.

In our last No. we sketched briefly the life of the new Bishop of Bangor. Of the other two Bishops, we have the following:

Dr. Tuffnell, Bishop of Brisbane, graduated at Oxford in 1837, when he was third class in classics. He was for many years Fellow of Wadham College, and Proctor in 1867. He was ordained by Dr. Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, in 1837. In 1844, he was presented to the perpetual curacy of Broad Town, near Marlborough, and in 1846 to the rectory of Beechingstoke, near Devizes. In 1850, Bishop Denison, of Salisbury, gave him the prebend of "Major Pars Altaris" in Salisbury Cathedral, and in 1858, at the urgent request of Dr. Hamilton, the present Bishop of Salisbury, he resigned Beechingstoke for the rectory of St. Peter, Marlborough, on the resignation of Sir Erasmus Wilson, Bart., now Chancellor of St. David's, at a considerable pecuniary sacrifice.

Dr. P. C. Cloughton, Bishop of St. Helena, graduated B. A., at Oxford, in 1835, when he took a first class in classics. He was ordained Deacon in 1837, and in the same year gained the Chancellor's prize for the English essay, "The Concurring Causes which assisted the Promulgation of the Religion of Mahomet." He became Fellow of University College, Oxford, by which society he was presented, in 1845, to the rectory of Elton, Huntingdonshire, when it was deserted by the Rev. F. W. Faber. He was public examiner in 1842-3, select preacher in 1844-5, and 1850-1, and for some years represented the Clergy of the Diocese of

Ely in the Lower House of Convocation, in whose proceedings he has always taken a warm and active interest.

CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP OF WAIAPU, NEW ZEALAND.

The ceremony of consecrating the Ven. William Williams, of Turanga, to the Bishopric of the native district of Waiapu, took place on Sunday afternoon, April 3, at St. Peter's, Te Aro. This Church was selected as being the largest in Wellington, and in order to afford opportunity for the Church-members of the outlying districts to attend, admission was directed to be by ticket. At half-past two, the Clergy of the Diocese and others now attending the Synod, entered the Church in full canonicals.

The Bishop of New Zealand conducted the principal part of the service, the Epistle being read by the Bishop of Wellington, the Gospel by the Bishop of Christchurch, and the Queen's commission, authorizing the consecration, by his Honor Mr. Justice Johnston. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of New Zealand, from the 2d Epistle to Timothy, ii, 1, 2—"Thou therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus; and the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou unto faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." It consisted of an elaborate defense of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, and after briefly alluding to the missionary labors of the Bishop elect—of the fruits of which the Rev. Riwai Te Ahu, who was then present, was an example—concluded with the expression of an earnest faith that much more would abound from the solemnities of the day.

CONVOCATION.—PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

The two Houses met for the dispatch of business on Wednesday, June 22d, and continued in session three days. The principal subjects discussed, are as follows; in making which statements, we abridge from the "*Clerical Journal*."

I. Diversities of representation, owing to the different modes of electing proctors in the several Dioceses.

II. A Missionary Episcopate, so arranged as not to trench upon the Catholic principle of non-interference with national Churches.

III. Tithes, in reference to a petition from the Tithe Redemption Trust.

IV. Special Services. It was distinctly understood that whatever might be done for the promotion of this object, not a word of the existing services was to be altered, but an appendix was to be inserted under proper authority. The debate on this subject was interesting and long, and much valuable opinion was elicited. A committee was appointed to draw up such services, which will be then submitted to both Houses, before an address in presented to the Crown on the subject.

V. Church-rates, especially in relation to a *gravamen* brought up by Arch-deacon Hale, that Parliament was proposing to alter the law without making any reference of the matter to the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation.

VI. Marriage and Divorce Act, on which there was much animated discussion.

VII. The Address to the Crown, the most important part of which is, in our opinion, the deprecating any alteration in the Book of Common Prayer.

It will be seen that two of the matters discussed and acted on in Convocation are of great importance; the appointing of a Missionary Episcopate; and the appointing of Special Services as an Appendix to the Prayer Book. The Bishop of Oxford moved both these questions in the Upper House. On Monday, July 4th, the Address was presented to the Queen; a formal account of which, as given in the English papers, will perhaps interest some of our readers. It has besides a moral to it.

"On Monday afternoon the Queen received at Buckingham Palace the Address from the Convocation of the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury. The Primate was attended by his officers, and by the members of the Upper House, in their

Convocation habits, and accompanied by the Prolocutor, and the members of the Lower House of Convocation, as follows:—

"The Vicar-General, Dr. Travers Twiss; the Registrar, Francis Hart Dyke, Esq.; the Apparitor-General, Felix Knyvett, Esq.; the Bishop of London, and the Bishop of Bath and Wells.

"The Dean of Bristol, Prolocutor of the Lower House.

"DEANS.—Westminster, Worcester, Norwich, Wells.

"PROCTORS FOR CHAPTERS.—The Rev. Richard Harvey, Gloucester; the Rev. Chancellor Morgan, Llandaff; Hon. and Rev. S. Waldegrave, Salisbury.

"ARCHDEACONS.—Bickersteth, Hale, Tattam, Bentinck.

"PROCTORS FOR THE CLERGY.—Mr. Riddell, Canterbury; Mr. Randolph, Winchester.

"Mr. Francis Cobb, Actuary.

"The Queen was conducted by the great officers of state to the throne. The Prince Consort was on her Majesty's left, the Prince of Wales was on the Queen's right. The members of the Convocation were ushered from the Green Drawing-room to the presence of the Queen, when the Archbishop of Canterbury advanced to her Majesty's right. The Prolocutor and members of the Lower House stood on the Queen's left, and his Grace read and delivered the Address to her Majesty which we have printed; who returned the following most gracious answer:—

"I receive with sincere satisfaction the renewed assurance of your loyal and affectionate attachment to my throne and person.

"I heartily concur in your feelings of gratitude to Almighty God for the restoration of tranquillity to my Indian dominions, and it is my earnest desire that the government of that country should be conducted in the spirit of mildness and charity, which is the distinguishing attribute of our holy religion.

"I rely upon the Christian sentiments of my subjects for supporting the pacific policy which has consistently guided my counsels.

"It will ever be my anxious wish that all measures may be adopted which have for their object the diffusion of true religion among all classes of my people, and which may tend to render the national Church an efficient instrument for promoting the spiritual welfare of the increasing population of this realm.

"The Archbishop of Canterbury received the answer from her Majesty, and, kneeling, had the honor of kissing hands, as had the Prolocutor, the Dean of Bristol.

PARLIAMENTARY INTELLIGENCE.

On Friday, June 10, an amendment to the Address of the Derby Ministry came to a vote in the Lower House; to the effect, "that the House considered it essential that Government should possess the confidence of Parliament, and that the House deems it its duty to say that such confidence is not reposed in the present advisers of the Crown." On this, the House divided; when there were *for* the amendment, 323; *against* it, 310; majority against the Government, 13.

On Friday, June 17, in the House of Lords, the official resignation of the Ministry was announced.

The New Cabinet is as follows:

First Lord of the Treasury,.....	Viscount Palmerston.
Lord Chancellor,.....	Lord Campbell.
President of the Council,.....	Earl Granville.
Foreign Secretary,.....	Lord J. Russell.
Home Secretary,.....	Sir G. C. Lewis.
Colonial Secretary,.....	Duke of Newcastle.
Secretary for War,.....	Mr. Sidney Herbert.
Indian Secretary,.....	Sir C. Wood.
Chancellor of the Exchequer,.....	Mr. W. E. Gladstone.
First Lord of the Admiralty,.....	Duke of Somerset.

Privy Seal.....	Duke of Argyll.
Duchy of Lancaster.....	Sir George Grey.
Postmaster General.....	Earl of Elgin.
Board of Trade.....	Mr. Milnor Gibson.
Poor-law Board.....	Mr. C. P. Villiers.
Secretary for Ireland.....	Mr. Cardwell.

Of this Ministry, the *London Times* says: "In one sense especially, Lord Palmerston's new Ministry may be entitled a first-class one, as so many of its members have taken first-class honors at Oxford or Cambridge, but chiefly at the former University. Thus in the Cabinet, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Cardwell, Sir C. Wood, Sir G. C. Lewis, the Earl of Elgin, and Sir George Grey, are all first-class men of Oxford, the first three being, moreover, double-firsts, while Mr. Gibson is a wrangler or first-classman of Cambridge. Out of the Cabinet there are Lord Wodehouse, Mr. C. Fortescue, Mr. Lowe, Sir R. Bethell, all Oxford first-class men; and Mr. F. Peel and Mr. Headlam, Cambridge men of similar rank. There are four more Oxford men in the Cabinet besides the six already mentioned, viz, the Duke of Somerset, Earl Granville, the Duke of Newcastle, and Mr. Sidney Herbert; the first three graduating without honors, and the latter obtaining a fourth class in classics. Thus, out of the sixteen noblemen and gentlemen comprising the Cabinet, ten are Oxford men."

On Wednesday, July 13, Sir J. Trelawny's Church Rates Abolition Bill was carried in the Lower House by a vote of 263 to 198; a majority of 70. It was subsequently withdrawn for want of time to take it into consideration.

In the Lower House, an Act enabling the Rev. Mr. Greive, a Scotch Clergyman, to hold preferment in England, which had passed the House of Lords, was lost on its second reading by the strong vote of 232 to 84. Mr. Greive had sided with the Rev. Mr. Cheyne against the Bishop of Aberdeen.

In the Upper House, July 29, Lord Ebury presented a petition from four hundred Clergymen, praying for a revision of the Liturgy, which was laid on the table. The Bishop of London, in his speech, said: "The petitioners proposed that the Athanasian Creed should be left; that all observances of saint's days should be omitted; that certain passages in the Absolution, and in the Baptism and Confirmation Services, should be altered or omitted. If that was the way in which the services were to be abbreviated, he confessed that he looked upon the proposal with considerable dissatisfaction. It was the glory of the Church of England that it was intended to be a national Church. It included within it persons of all those varieties of sentiment which were sure to be found in an intelligent and large national Church. If they did not feel their own consciences forced by particular expressions in the Church service, they were quite willing to allow those same expressions to remain, which as individuals, perhaps, they might wish to see altered."

This petition which is before us, contemplates alterations of the most radical character, in the Liturgy, and in the Baptismal, Ordination, Consecration, and Burial Services, and in the Catechism.

Parliament was prorogued August 13th.

DIOCESAN SYNOD OF MONTREAL.

In 1856, the Churchmen of this Diocese met in large numbers and resolved to take measures to form a Diocesan Synod for the due administration of the Diocese and to carry on the work of the Church. An enabling Act having been obtained from the Provincial Legislature and the Royal assent received, the first regularly organized Synod met in Montreal, June 7th, there being present forty-eight of the fifty-three Clergy, and ninety-one Lay delegates. The Bishop delivered a very able address on the proper organization, the duties and functions of Diocesan

and Provincial Synods. The Declaration and Constitution of the Synod were adopted after a spirited debate. The great question discussed was whether the Synod should consist of *three* distinct branches, Bishop, Clergy, and Laity; or only of *two*, Clergy and Laity. In other words, whether the Bishop should have a *veto*, as it is called, on the Clergy and Laity; as both the Clergy and Laity have on the action of the Synod. That is, whether the Government of the Church shall be, in any respect, and that a very limited one, Episcopal; or, whether it shall be merely Presbyterian and Lay. On a division, this veto power was given to the Bishop, there being only twenty-three, in all, opposed to it. It is required that the Lay delegates shall be Communicants. It is noteworthy, that in all the Colonial Diocesan Synods, thus far organized, this *veto* power has been given to the Bishop; as in Toronto, Huron, Nova-Scotia, Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, and New Zealand.

The Bishop was also requested to petition her Majesty to appoint one of the Bishops a Metropolitan, to preside over Provincial Synods.

At this important primary Synod, the organization of our own Dioceses in the United States, and the history of that organization, were pretty freely and fully canvassed; and some things were said which deserve to be repeated in the hearing of every American Churchman; especially as there are principles involved in this whole question of vital importance. Government, Jurisdiction, Ministration, are terms so loosely used in our own American Church, as to indicate a great want of appreciation of certain fundamental principles which the Church has recognized from the very beginning. This whole subject is vastly important, and, we need not say, deserves to be thoroughly ventilated.

RELIGIOUS EXCITEMENT IN IRELAND.

The religious newspapers give information of a remarkable "awakening" in the districts about Belfast and throughout the north of Ireland. According to some of our own American papers, to express the least doubt as to the character of this excitement, would be little less than blasphemy. That there is a marked increase of religious feeling, and very striking changes in the moral habits of many of the lower class of people, is confessed on all hands; but that Satan, and ignorant and misguided men, are also busy at work, is manifest. Prostration of strength, spasms, convulsions, hysterics, idiocy, epilepsy, hopeless insanity, and even death, are among the fruits of the "Revival," so called. Meanwhile, many of the Clergy of the Irish Church are exerting themselves to turn the awakened religious feeling into the right channel. As a sample of what is said of this Revival, the Rev. George Gilfillan, a Scotch Presbyterian, and not the best authority, lately, in a Sermon, used the following language:

"As to the Irish revival he had great doubts. The excesses of excitement; the cries, shrieks, groans uttered; people carried out of Church in fits; some driven mad and others hurried into extravagances of fierce and savage fanaticism—all tended to convince him that, let Dr. Cook, of Belfast, say what he pleased, it was hitherto as authentic a work of the Devil as was ever transacted on this planet. There were, he understood, people who wished us to take a pattern from our Irish friends; but he would tell his people to be on their guard."

A large amount of Foreign Intelligence laid over for want of room.